MISTAKES

AND

MISSTATEMENTS

OF

MYERS.

RANDALL.

BIBLIOTHECA
FF. PRÆDICATORUM
CONVENTUS
CIVIT. BENITIÆ
Lit. 904
Pl.
ST. ALBERT'S COLLEGE LIBRARY

MISTAKES

AND

MISSTATEMENTS

OF

MYERS

OR

Notes on Myers' Mediaeval and Modern History.

BY

REV. WILLIAM E. RANDALL.

Sept. 17, 1903.
SACRED HEART CHURCH,
Columbia, Mo.

ST. ALBERT'S COLLEGE LIBRARY

Entered according to act of Congress, in the year 1903, by Rev. Wm. E. Randall, in the office of the Librarian of Congress, at Washington.

Press of Little & Becker.

INTRODUCTION.

To the Student Readers:—Our national and state constitutions guarantee religious liberty to all citizens, men and women, youths and adults; and all efforts to infringe that liberty are unconstitutional and tyrannous, condemned alike by the letter of our laws and the spirit of our people. To the religious opinions of the author of Myers' History, the State of Missouri has given no indorsement, and no discrimination in scholastic grading can legally be made against any public school scholar for refusing to accept them. They are merely personal opinions, without a vestige of governmental authorization, and may be rejected by the pupil as freely and fully as though they had not appeared in a State text book. So far the scholar's legal right extends; but he has a moral right which may at times amount to a duty, to repel in a dignified and public manner, the author's slanders of the Catholic Church. An intelligent explanation and loyal vindication of Catholic doctrine by a Catholic pupil will generally receive, as it merits, the approbation of both teacher and pupils; but whether it does or not, let the Catholic remember that his religious liberty is a governmental guarantee, and not subordinate to that of his teacher.

Wm E. Randall

OUTLINES OF MEDIAEVAL AND MODERN HISTORY.

GENERAL INTRODUCTION.

Divisions of the Subject.

Chief Characteristics of the Four Periods.—

Myers—"The events that mark the period (of the Dark Ages) are, * * * the growth of the Papacy, etc."

Comment—It will no doubt be interesting to Mr. Myers to learn that since the institution of the Papacy by Christ our Lord, it has not grown; and that his eighth chapter, wherein he formally and at length treats the subject, should never have been written. But whereas the Papacy has not grown, or changed in power or prerogative, popular recognition and understanding of it, as well as obedience to it, have grown; in like manner the means by which information is transmitted and diffused, have been perfected more and more, thereby increasing the efficacy of the Papal administration.

Mr. Myers gives us in the preface a long list of books whose guidance he "mainly followed in treating the subjects with which they severally deal," among which we find Alzog's Universal Church History. It is to be regretted that instead of following this learned

ST. ALBERT'S COLLEGE LIBRARY

author, he chose to propose some religious theories of his own.

MYERS—"The last century of the second period especially was marked by a great intellectual revival, by improvements, inventions and discoveries, which greatly stirred men's minds, and awakened them as from a sleep. It was the age of intellectual emancipation. Man came to know the truth about himself and the universe, and the truth made him free."

Comment—This is a unique, though not altogether a new way of applying the Holy Scriptures. It was our Saviour who first used these words, promising freedom to those who retained the truth, but he did not authorize the present application of them. His promise was: "If you continue in my word, you shall be my disciples indeed; and you shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free." Our Lord speaks not here of secular knowledge, but of Christian truth; and not of corporal liberty, but of spiritual freedom. "They answered him: We are the seed of Abraham, and we have never been slaves to any man: How sayest thou; You shall be free? Jesus answered them: Amen, amen, I say unto you: that whosoever committeth sin, is the servant of sin, * * * If, therefore, the Son shall make you free, you shall be free indeed."

It is not, therefore, inventions and discoveries, ocean steamers and wireless telegraphy that emancipate mankind, but faith and the Christian virtues. We mention this false interpretation because it is being used by a large and influential body of American educators to invest secular knowledge with the power to free mankind from all bondage and from every ill.

MYERS—"The era of the Reformation * * * naturally followed the Age of Revival, for intellectual emancipation is sure to lead to religious reform and freedom."

Comment—St. Paul was of quite another mind, and regarded great secular knowledge of no spiritual advantage. He wrote of the learned heathen philosophers, that "professing themselves to be (worldly) wise they became (spiritual) fools."

We read that the common people gladly heard and followed our Lord, while the learned, for the most part, opposed him. We know that comparatively few eminent scientists and literati are remarkable for their piety. It was so in the days of the Apostles, and it has ever been so.

MYERS—"The third period is characterized by the great religious movement known as the Reformation."

Comment—The Reformation was essentially an irreligious movement, for it was a movement away from the religion of Christ. A further proof of its irreligious character can be seen in its fruits: the vast majority of the descendants of the Reformers are to-day, practically, if not nominally, infidels.

MYERS—"The immediate issue of the Reformation was the freeing of Northern Europe from the absolute spiritual dominion of Rome."

Comment—And Christ; just as the immediate issue of the revolt of the rebel angels was their freedom from the Kingdom of God. Not every thing that bears the name of freedom is a blessing.

MYERS—"The more distant result (of the Reformation) was or will be the securing of religious freedom to all the world."

Comment—The author does wisely in inserting the clause "or will be," for some of the sects still maintain that dissenters should be put to the sword.

MYERS—(The Reformation will secure) "the recognition of the right of every man to hold, avow and teach such views in regard to religious matters as may seem to him to be true."

Comment—And as no one can say what seems to the speaker to be true, the Reformation would secure to him the right to teach publicly any doctrine, no matter how erroneous, how corrupt, or how dangerous. The Reformation would secure to the descendants of Brigham Young the right to preach Mormonism and Polygamy; to the Czolgoszes the right to teach anarchy and assassination; and to Rev. Mrs. Roberts the right to advocate the murder of malformed babies, incurable invalids and maniacs. We readily concede to the professor the honor he claims for the Reformation.

MYERS—"The chief events of the era (Reformation Era) are * * * * the ascendency of the Catholic and despotic power of Spain," etc.

Comment—There is no reason why Spain should be called despotic, except that she was Catholic. Mr. Myers stated in the preface that he would avoid a controversial tone, perhaps because he could not sustain himself in controversy; but you will discover that he does not avoid insulting insinuations.

Relation to World History of the Fall of Rome.—

Relation of the Mediaeval to the Modern Age.—

Elements of Civilization Transmitted by Rome.—

Graeco-Roman Civilization.—

MYERS—"'The Papacy,' in the language of Hobbes, 'was but the ghost of the deceased Roman Empire crowned and seated upon the grave thereof.'"

Comment—Hobbes was about as far from sanity in his religious opinions as a man can well be, and as incompetent to judge the Papacy as an Eskimo; but as he cherished Reformation views as to a man's right to express himself, whether competent or not, on any and all subjects, he penned the above sentence, to his everlasting disgrace.

Mr. Myers, who lacks both the originality and boldness of Hobbes, while he shares his blindness in spiritual things, found the passage and copied it; not perceiving that either its authorship was disgraceful to Hobbes, or its reprint shameful to himself. These one-eyed men who, looking on the divine institution of the Papacy, judge it a human invention, strikingly remind us of the unbelieving Jews, who, when they heard our Saviour's wisdom, remarked: "This is the carpenter's son."

Christianity.—

MYERS—"The religion which Rome gave to her conquerors was quite different from that taught by Christ and His Apostles."

Comment—Is it possible? Well, this is news, indeed! Doubtless this modern oracle from his perch on College Hill, sees strange sights, and hears wondrous sounds. It is really too bad that in his effort to enlighten the age, and set the world right in this matter of the change and corruption of the Christian faith, he should be opposed by the unanimous testimony of the monuments of Chris-

tianity, by the writings of all the Fathers and Doctors of the Church, and the universal Christian tradition.

MYERS—"Giving this religion to the Teutonic nations, Rome gave them something which was destined to produce a profound influence upon all their future. It shaped all the events of their history. It moulded all their ideas and institutions. It informed all their literatures, and ennobled their architecture, their painting and their sculpture. It covered Europe with monasteries, cathedrals and schools. It abolished servitude, inspired the crusades and aided powerfully in the creation of chivalry. It added to mediaeval history the chapter on the Papacy. * * * * It blessed Europe with the Truce of God."

Comment—And this was a religion quite different from that taught by Christ and his Apostles? It is hard to believe that a man-made religion could be so powerful. We find heresy everywhere sick and dying, and incapable of active effort or salutary influence. May it not be that our historic oracle made a "lapsus pennæ?" Let us hear him again.

MYERS—"This religion, first going forth from Semitic Judea, was given to the younger world by the missionaries of Rome."

Comment—Why, how is this? Mr. Myers just now asserted that the religion which Rome gave to her conquerors was not the religion taught by Christ and his Apostles; now he says that it was; that it went forth from Semitic Judea. Alas, our sage historian has been dreaming. Perhaps in the horrid darkness of the night, Luther's devil appeared and told him that the true religion of Christ appeared in Germany in 1524. But I am

afraid that his critics will hardly excuse him for a chronological error of many centuries, or a geographical error of several hundred miles.

The Teutons.—

Their Capacity for Civilization.—

Their Love of Personal Freedom.—

MYERS—"In this sentiment of individualism, this idea that a man has a right to himself, lay hidden the germ of Protestant Christianity."

Comment—We thank the learned author for the admission that the idea that a man has a right to himself, is the germ of Protestanism; and, we presume, the idea that a man has not a right to himself, is the germ of Catholicism. Now, which is true? Has a man a right to himself, or has he not? He certainly has not. Religion is not a matter between man and man, but between man and God, and man has no rights before God, but duties only. God made you and you are his, and you have absolutely no right to yourself. But not only have you no rights before God immediately, but you have no rights before God's institutions and delegates, in so far as they possess divine authority. The correlative of parental authority is filial obedience; of civil authority, civil subjection; and of ecclesiastical authority, religious obedience. Now, in the very nature of the case, the Church, the highest divine authority on earth, must determine her own powers and prerogatives, as does every supreme court. Hence, to refuse obedience to the Church, and assert our right to ourselves, our independence of her, is to rebel against God, and make ourselves

"like the heathen and the publican." This conclusion may not be altogether flattering to Protestantism, but that is not the fault of logic.

Their Reverence for Womanhood.—

MYERS—"A feeling of respect for woman characterized all the northern or Teutonic peoples. * * * This sentiment guarded the purity and sancity of the home."

Comment—This effusion of sentimentality is the effect of feeling, not reason. There were, indeed, degrees of degradation in the condition of pagan women; but whether ancient or modern, whether Roman or Teutonic, they were all despised and maltreated. A woman before marriage was the property of her father, and after marriage, the property of her husband, and, like other property, could be bought and sold. It was our dear Lord who raised up woman, and in the person of his blessed Mother, woman was exalted. The Church in christianizing pagan nations, gave the woman a reason for respecting herself, and her own self-respect compelled the respect of men.

MYERS—"Although monasticism certainly degraded woman, it cannot be doubted that the general influence of Christianity has been to elevate and dignify her."

Comment—College Hill must be deeply veiled in the cloudy curtains of the sky, to have enabled this living curio to escape the eager eye of Barnum, and a niche in his museum. Everybody knows that no women in the world are so admired and reverenced as our religious nuns and sisters.

MYERS—"It is only among the Teutonic nations,

or among peoples that have felt their influence, that the family is the actual unit of society, and woman the real companion and equal of man."

Comment—The family is the unit of society, and woman is the companion and moral equal of man, wherever and only where the Catholic Church has extended her influence. We recommend to our author the careful perusal of a recent encyclical of Pope Leo XIII, in which he formally treats this very subject.

Celts, Slavonians and Other Peoples.—

PART 1.

MEDIAEVAL HISTORY.

FIRST PERIOD—The Dark Ages.

CHAPTER I.

MIGRATIONS AND SETTLEMENTS OF THE TEUTONIC TRIBES.

Kingdom of the Ostrogoths.—

Kingdom of the Visigoths.—

Kingdom of the Burgundians.—

Kingdom of the Vandals.—

MYERS—"Being Arian Christians, they (the Vandals) persecuted with furious zeal the orthodox party, the followers of Athanasius."

Comment—Naturally, you will ask yourselves, who was this Athanasius whom the orthodox Christians followed? He was St. Athanasius, Patriarch of Alexandria, Egypt. The author says that the heretical Vandals waged war against his followers, the orthodox Christians, the African Catholics; and the Catholic Eastern Emperor, Justinian, sent Belisarius to restore the African province to the bosom of the Catholic Church. Here are Christians, occupying the extremities of the earth, east, south-east and south-west, all, as can be easily shown, in intimate communion with Rome, firmly united among themselves, and declared by our author to

be true orthodox Catholics. Should, therefore, any Protestant friend ask you how you know that the early Christians of the fifth and sixth centuries were Catholics, you can refer him to this anti-Catholic authority for proof.

The Franks under the Merovingians.—

MYERS—"The Bishops of the Christian Church * * * * in Gaul * * * * espoused with all the weight of their authority, which was not small, * * * the cause of Clovis, hoping in return to receive his support in their contest with the yet unconverted enemies of the Church."

Comment—The author's statement is somewhat inaccurate; the Bishops of Gaul did not unanimously espouse the cause of Clovis, though many of them did, because the times were troublous and there was urgent need of an able monarch, and Clovis seemed to possess the requisite ability.

The author says more truly that the Bishops had great authority over even the unconverted barbarians. The pagans witnessed the miracles they wrought, recognized the finger of God, and feared.

Kingdom of the Lombards.—

MYERS—"When they (the Lombards) entered Italy they were Christians of the Arian sect; but afterwards they became converts to the orthodox faith of the Roman Church, and Pope Gregory I bestowed upon the Lombard king an iron crown."

Comment—Let us recount and sum up the admissions which Mr. Myers has already made. The Church

ST. ALBERT'S COLLEGE LIBRARY

which Christ our Lord founded, and against which he promised the gates of hell should not prevail, established itself by the preaching of the Apostles, first in Jerusalem and the surrounding country; then, "going forth from Semitic Judea," it converted the Roman Empire, and was extended "by the missionaries of Rome, to the younger world," the heathen nations, who, one after another, were converted. Now, in the face of these admissions we look forward with expectant interest to our author's effort to justify the Protestant Rebellion against the Catholic Church.

The Anglo-Saxon Conquest of Britain.—

Teutonic Tribes Outside the Empire.—

CHAPTER II.

I. The Introduction of Christianity Among the Different Tribes.

Introductory.—

Myers—"Those peoples who have no temples have but a small attachment to their own religion."

Comment—It may reasonably be questioned whether the Hebrews had a greater attachment to their religion after, than before the building of the temple by King Solomon.

Myers—"Races whose religion is merely traditional and not yet embalmed in literature, will more readily give it up in exchange for a new than those whose faith is conserved by the authority of books venerable through age, and sacred by virtue of mysterious or forgotten origin."

Comment—Is there any race "whose religion is merely traditional and not yet embalmed" in some kind of literature, written or spoken? There is none such.

Myers—"(Those races) will more readily give it (their religion) up in exchange for a new, than those whose faith is conserved by the authority of books venerable through age, and sacred by virtue of mysterious or forgotten origin."

Comment—Faith is not, and cannot be, conserved by books, either of ancient or modern origin, for the reason that a book can, at most, conserve only letters

and words, but not their sense, which varies with the interpreters. The reason why faith is conserved among Catholics is that the interpreter, the Church, is one and infallible. Among Protestants every man is his own fallible interpreter, the Revealed Truth is rent to fragments, and a speedy end is made of faith.

MYERS—"Whose faith is conserved by the authority of books, venerable through age, and sacred by virtue of mysterious or forgotten origin."

Comment—We were not aware that books of forgotten origin were more sacred than those of remembered origin. We would be deeply indebted to Mr. Myers if he would kindly mention a book whose sacredness is in any way due to the oblivion of its origin.

Progress of Christianity Before the Fall of Rome.—

Conversion of the Goths.—

Conversion of the Vandals and Other Tribes.—

Conversion of the Franks.—

MYERS—(Clovis in desperate circumstances called upon God for help, whereupon the tide of battle suddenly changed.)

"This incident illustrates how the very superstitions of the barbarians, their belief in omens and divine interpositions contributed to their conversion."

Comment—Here is a good illustration of how "books sacred by virtue of mysterious or forgotten origin" conserve the faith for some Protestants. The Bible abounds with relations of how God at diverse times has interposed in the affairs of men; and now comes our famous

professor, fresh from his eloquent espousal of the cause of the Reformers, with their Bible as the sole and sufficient rule of faith, and solemnly declares that belief in "divine interpositions" is superstition. Now, a good way to test a doctrine is to follow out its consequences. If belief in "divine interpositions" is superstition, "divine interpositions" are unreal, fallacious; but as the gifts of prophecy and miracles, the inspiration of Holy Scriptures, and the mission of Christ, are "divine interpositions," they are unreal; therefore Christianity is a fraud. We always thought that the professor was an infidel.

Myers—(The Bulgarians in the time of plague, sought refuge and relief by a profession of the Christian faith.) "In like manner the Burgundians * * * * embraced in a body the religion of the Christians. Thus the reception of the new faith was often a tribal or national affair, rather than a matter of personal conviction."

Comment—Is there any reason why a visible and wonderful interposition of God, extending to, and affecting a whole nation, should be incapable of bringing personal conviction to every member of the nation? If a miracle wrought by God for the preservation of an individual is sufficient to bring personal conviction to the mind of that individual, doubtless a miracle wrought for the preservation of a nation could personally convince the whole nation.

Augustine's Mission to England.—

Myers—(The pagan Angles and Saxons drove westward the Catholic Welsh, and occupied the lands left vacant by them.) "The Welsh still retained the

Christian faith; but they felt no inclination to help these barbarians who had robbed them of their lands, to secure a title to the heavenly inheritance."

Comment—Our divine Lord taught the kind of retribution the Christian should seek: "Love your enemies; do good to them that hate you, and pray for them that persecute and calumniate you." The Welsh, in so far as they were Catholics, possessed this spirit, but their ability to give to their enemies the true faith may not have been commensurate with their inclination or desire. Their visits would have been suspected, and their efforts opposed and nullified.

The Celtic Church.—

MYERS—(Irish missionaries traversed every land.) "For a time it seemed as if Celtic, and not Latin Christianity was to mould the destinies of the churches of the west."

Comment—There is no difference, not even a distinction, between Celtic and Latin Christianity: they are identical, the one Roman Catholic Church. Before undertaking his missionary labors in Ireland, St. Patrick had travelled into Italy where he received from Pope Celestine I his mission and the Apostolic benediction.

The Celtic Mission to Northumbria.—

Rivalry Between the Roman and the Celtic Church.—

MYERS—"The Celtic Church * * * * was inclined to look upon St. John rather than upon St. Peter as the apostle of pre-eminence."

Comment—There may have been some private discussion as to which was pre-eminent in our Lord's affec-

tion; but there was no question as to St. Peter's pre-eminence in jurisdiction; and Mr. Myers himself states that the Celtic monks admitted that Christ gave to St. Peter the keys of the kingdom of heaven.

MYERS—"The Celtic Church * * * * had come to differ somewhat from it (the Roman Church), in the matter of certain ceremonies and observances."

Comment—The Celtic Church is the Catholic Church among the Celts, and the Roman Church is the Catholic Church in Rome. The discussion concerned the day on which Easter should be celebrated. It was a mere matter of discipline, and occasioned neither rivalry, rupture, nor serious disturbance.

The Council of Whitby.—

MYERS—"The decision of the prudent Oswy gave the British Isles to Rome."

Comment—All the parties concerned professed the faith of the Roman Catholic Church; all acknowledged her divine authority and no one desired, or even thought of refusing obedience, and going into heresy or schism. There was no ominous significance in the discussion and settlement of the question. To this day little differences of ceremonial frequently come up for adjudication by the Church.

The Roman Victory Fortunate for England.—

MYERS—"In this struggle between the Celtic and the Roman Church * * * * there is no doubt but that it was very fortunate for England that the controversy turned as it did."

Comment—There was no struggle between the Celtic and the Roman Church. The Celts were professed subjects of the Roman Catholic Church and obedient to her commands. A delegation of Celtic monks attended the Council of Whitby to present their arguments why Rome should permit them to continue their local observance, which differed somewhat from the general custom. Now, what vital interest of England depended on the decision of Rome, either granting or refusing the request?

MYERS—"The re-establishment of the connection of the island with Roman civilization."

Comment—Not at all. That depended on the union of England with the Roman Catholic Church, and not upon a ceremony.

MYERS—"Now all this advantage would have been lost had Iona instead of Rome won at Whitby."

Comment—As Rome was the judge, she could not lose. We would advise the author to purchase a child's catechism, if he would not make himself ridiculous.

Pagan and Christian Literature of the Anglo-Saxons.—

Effect of Conversion upon the Martial Spirit of the Anglo-Saxons.—

MYERS—"The conversion of England was effected chiefly through the labor of monks, and consequently it was the monastic form of Christianity that was introduced."

Comment—Christianity, or Catholicity, has no monastic form, no parochial form, no collegiate form and no

secular form—it has the Christian form. A monk has the same form of Christianity as a layman or a diocesan priest.

MYERS—"The land became crowded with monasteries and nunneries."

Comment—But not overcrowded. Our Saviour said: "If thou will be perfect, go, sell what thou hast and give it to the poor, and thou shalt have treasure in heaven; and come follow me." Perfection cannot be excessive, or too universal.

MYERS—"More than thirty kings and queens descended from the throne to end their days in cloistral retreats."

Comment—And thereby set their subjects a salutary example. Truly was England then called "The Isle of Saints."

MYERS—"Perhaps no other Teutonic tribes gave up so much of their native strength upon receiving Christianity, as did the Angles and Saxons of Britain."

Comment—Perhaps no other Teutonic tribes gave up so much of their native ferocity.

MYERS—"The practice of arms was discouraged and neglected."

Comment—The excessive and cruel use of arms was discouraged and neglected.

MYERS—"The people became a 'nation of praying monks.'"

Comment—The best warriors in the world have been men of prayer. If you would be convinced, read the two books of Machabees.

MYERS—"The decay of the martial spirit in a martial age, * * * * brought upon England centuries of invasion, woe and disaster."

Comment—The Angles and Saxons had been freebooters before they became Christians. Christianity did not rob them of their fortitude and courage, though it diverted their minds from war and the chase, to more peaceful and profitable pursuits, and very naturally they ceased to be as skillful swordsmen and archers as they had been. Surely our author is a severe critic. Barbarians are condemned for devoting themselves to the art of war, and Christians are condemned for devoting themselves to the arts of peace.

MYERS—"The infusion of the fresh blood of the northern peoples (the Danes or Northmen), resulted finally in the revival of the early vigor and martial spirit of the nation."

Comment—How could that be since it did not lessen the number of "monasteries and nunneries," nor silence the voice of the "nation of praying monks?"

The Conversion of Germany.—

MYERS—"The conversion of the tribes of Germany was effected by Celtic, Anglo-Saxon and Frankish missionaries—and the sword of Charlemagne."

Comment—This is very smart, and a fair specimen of the author's delicate drollery; but it will not succeed. Enemies are physically, not spiritually subdued by the sword. Charlemagne repressed the violence of the savage pagans and made the residence and labor of the Christian missionaries possible among them. For this,

his salutary co-operation with the Church, he is sneeringly styled "a Christian Mohammed." The sneer would come with better grace from a heathen than a Christian historian.

MYERS—"Russia's * * * * evangelization was effected by the missionaries * * * * of the Greek or Eastern Church."

Comment—The work of conversion was effected at the time that the Greek Church was still united with Rome. Schismatical and heretical sects are ever barren in their missionary labors.

Christianity in the North.—

MYERS—(In Iceland any one publicly worshipping the ancient deities was to be punished.) "But private worship, the exposing of infants, the eating of horse-flesh and other practices not inconsistent with the precepts of Christianity, were still tolerated."

Comment—Surely the author does not mean to say that private pagan worship or the eating of horse-flesh as a religious rite, both of which are sins against the first commandment, or the exposing of infants to death, a transgression of the fifth commandment; are not inconsistent with the precepts of Christianity. Nor can he mean that these sins were tolerated by the Church. It is impossible to determine his meaning from his words, and we doubt if he himself attaches any definite meaning to them. Perhaps, being occult sins, and therefore beyond the cognizance of the civil law, they were not legislated against.

MYERS—"By the opening of the fourteenth century all Europe was claimed by Christianity, save a limited dis-

trict in Southern Spain held by the Moors, and another in the Baltic regions possessed by the still pagan Finns and Lapps."

Comment—The whole civilized world, and much of the uncivilized world, was now Catholic. In less than thirteen centuries the great work of evangelizing the world had been accomplished. You shall soon learn how this magnificent work was in part undone by the machinations of proud and unscrupulous men.

The Paganizing of Christianity.—

MYERS—"The subjects of the Roman Empire, in adopting the new religion in exchange for their own, had mingled with it many of their heathen notions and rites. Then, when these semi-Christian Latins imparted this modified Christianity to their conquerors, it naturally underwent a still further corruption among the latter."

Comment—The author labors hard to prove that there is no pure Christianity in the world. He does not blame the Catholic Church for what it could not prevent. Christian truth, he says, in its passage down the ages, from nation to nation, from the civilized to the semi-civilized and to the barbarian; from the Christian to the semi-Christian and to the heathen, was obscured, and Christian morality was corrupted; pagan myth mingled with divine truth and pagan rite with Christian ceremony. Now, what the author says actually happened, most certainly would have happened, had not our divine Saviour with divine wisdom placed an infallible teaching authority in his Church for the very purpose of preventing the introduction of, or eliminating, the pagan myth and the pagan rite and the pagan vice, and preserving Christian truth and morality integral and immaculate.

MYERS—"The simple-minded barbarians being utterly unable to comprehend the metaphysical subtleties elaborated by the Greek and Latin Fathers out of the plain doctrines and precepts of Christ and the teachings of His disciples, naturally fell away into all sorts of heresies."

Comment—The simple-minded barbarians were innocent of all acquaintance with the metaphysical subtleties elaborated by the Greek and Latin Fathers. The Church does not teach metaphysical or theological subtleties to simple-minded people, whether barbarians or civilized. She teaches them the plain truths of Christian doctrine.

MYERS—"The Church even intentionally transformed herself * * * * * * 'She made herself a child to prattle with her child, and translated the ineffable to it in puerile legend.'"

Comment—The author has just now told us that the Church taught "the simple-minded barbarians metaphysical subtleties elaborated by the Greek and Latin Fathers." That, he thinks, was most blamable. And now he condemns the Church for having avoided "metaphysical subtleties," and having "prattled with her child" as a child. Verily, he is a hard man to please. The plain truth is that the Catholic missionary did and does what every sensible teacher does, accommodated his discourse to the capacity of his hearers.

MYERS—" 'To dazzle the senses of the barbarians, and work upon their imagination,' says Guizot, 'she increased wonderfully the number, pomp, and variety of her religious ceremonies.'"

Comment—The Church does not institute ceremonies to dazzle or bewilder. Ceremonies are auxiliary, and al-

ways in strict harmony with the mystery that is commemorated, or the feast that is celebrated.

MYERS—"Many of our religious ideas, festivals and ceremonies, as witness Easter and Christmas, may be traced back to an origin in the practices and beliefs of our heathen ancestors."

Comment—We have a very strong suspicion that the professor is talking through his professorial hat. What did "our heathen ancestors" know about Christmas? Why, the Incarnation was a mystery hidden from the beginning, not even revealed to the angels; and, ignorant that the "Word was made flesh," our "heathen ancestors" could know nothing of the resurrection of the flesh.

II. DEVELOPMENT OF THE MONASTIC SYSTEM.

Origin of Monasticism.—

MYERS—"The central idea underlying the system is, that the body is a weight and hindrance to the spirit; and that it is especially meritorious to refuse gratification to all those appetites and instincts that have their rise in our physical nature."

Comment—We beg leave to inform the learned author that he misunderstands monasticism; and that the "central idea" which he imagines "underlying the system," is the veriest fiction. Monasticism is not manichaeism, and he does not evince much "metaphysical subtlety" in confounding them. In the hope of setting him right, we will quote a passage from the great monastic authority, Thomas A'Kempis: "Sometimes, indeed, we must do violence, and manfully resist the sensual appetite, and not regard what the flesh liketh or disliketh, but rather

endeavor that, even against its will, it may be subject to the spirit.

"And so long must it be chastised and kept in servitude, till it readily obey in all things, and learn to be content with a little, and to be pleased with simplicity and not to murmur at any inconvenience."

Does our author think that our sensual appetites should be gratified in all things, and that passion and not reason should govern man's conduct?

MYERS—"In the ascetic mode of life adopted * * * * by Elijah and John the Baptist, we find illustration of this" (monasticism).

Comment—Does our author venture to criticise the ascetic lives of Elijah and St. John the Baptist? Ingersoll once toured the country, delivering his famous lecture, "Mistakes of Moses." The world may yet be treated to a companion piece, "Mistakes of Elijah and John the Baptist."

MYERS—"A misconception of certain Scriptural texts * * * which enjoin the mortification of the flesh, encouraged and fostered the doctrine (of monasticism)."

Comment—Who is this unfledged upstart who dares compare his penny candle, veiled in darkness, with those great luminaries of the desert, and tell them that they did not understand the Scriptures? "A little learning is a dangerous thing."

MYERS—"It was not, however, until the beginning of the third century that the idea became a part of the theology of the Church."

Comment—The idea, the "central idea" of monasticism, which the author tells us is asceticism, though he

misunderstands it, is as old as Christianity, and has at all times been taught and practiced in the Church. He calls the monastic spirit a "strange enthusiasm," because he is a stranger to it; and he likens it to a pest because the carnal man despises mortification of the flesh.

MYERS—"These pious enthusiasts of the desert, renouncing family and friends and the world, thought by the most ingenious self-torture and sacrifice of the body to make sure of the salvation of their souls."

Comment—St. Paul says: "I chastise my body, and bring it into subjection: lest perhaps, when I have preached to others, I myself should become a cast-away." Now, if the great apostle was afraid to omit corporal chastisement, lest he should become a cast-away; has not Mr. Myers reason to fear that its omission should effect his own reprobation? Perhaps the "pious enthusiasts of the desert" were not so foolish after all. We think that Mr. Myers calumniates the memory of the saints dead just as the hostile world persecuted them living. It is not true that the monks and hermits of the desert placed their hope of heaven in the maceration of the body, but they reduced their sensual passions to servitude, that they might be free to cultivate heroic Christian virtues in peace.

MYERS—"Some acquired the reputation of immaculate purity of soul by allowing their bodies, untouched by water, to accumulate the filth of half a century."

Comment—And others there are, but neither saints nor solitaries, who have acquired a reputation for learning by stupid criticisms; who suffer their souls to accumulate the spiritual filth of half a century, yet are fastidious about their personal appearance.

MYERS—"The most renowned of all, however, was St. Simeon Stylites, who spent thirty years on a pillar sixty feet high and only three feet in circumference, thereby earning the titles of Star of the Earth and Wonder of the World."

Comment—Mr. Myers thinks that St. Simeon was called "Star of the Earth" because he was up in the air; and that he was called "Wonder of the World" because he never fell down.

MYERS—"On this aerial perch 'he remained exposed to every change of climate, ceaselessly and rapidly bending his body in prayer almost to the level of his feet.' "

Comment—No, not ceaselessly. He preached to the people at stated times, and one sermon did more good than all Myers' histories combined,—to say nothing of evil.

MYERS—" 'His biographer was commissioned to stand by his side, to pick up the worms that fell from his body, and replace them in the sores.' "

Comment—Doubtless our author wonders whether the biographer was called "Wonder of the World," seeing that he, too, did not fall from the pillar.

MYERS—" 'To pick up the worms, and replace them in the sores, the Saint saying to the worm, "Eat what God has given you." ' "

Comment—Some persons there are who shudder at a temporal worm, yet fear not the eternal one, that dieth not though it inhabiteth inextinguishable fire. St. Simeon was not one of these, but with St. Augustine he prayed: "Here strike, O God; here burn;" here let the worm devour, "but spare me for eternity." The author

adds that "a crowd of prelates followed the saint to the grave," praising and approving his heroic discipline. Furthermore the infallible Church has canonized him. Let this suffice. We add only what is most evident, that St. Simeon belongs to that class of exalted Christian heroes, who are to be admired rather than imitated.

Monasticism in the West.—

MYERS—"The rules of this fraternity (Benedictine order) were simple and some of them very sensible, as for instance that which made work with the hands a pious duty."

Comment—Servile work of itself is not a "pious duty," nor a pious occupation. Manual labor, like every other employment, is sanctified by the virtuous intention of the doer, not otherwise. All the talk about the nobility and sanctity of labor is mere trash.

Advantages of the Monastic System.—

Evils of the System.—

MYERS—"The religious orders too often forgot or neglected their vows, and the monasteries, instead of fostering piety and devotion, became the nurseries of indolence and profligacy."

Comment—No, not "nurseries of indolence and profligacy." There was one wicked apostle, but the apostolic college was not a college of wickedness. There have been profligate monks, but the monasteries were not nurseries of profligacy.

MYERS—"The tendency of the entire system was to cast contempt upon woman and degrade the domestic relations."

Comment—The author pours out his crude statements with the recklessness of a mountebank. He is a quack historian, and no amount of self-assurance or bravado can save him from contempt, or his profession from the contamination of his company. The tendency and effect of the system has been the very opposite of the author's declaration. Every Catholic child knows that religious women by their vows sanctify virginity, and shed a salutary and elevating influence upon all the feminine domestic relations.

MYERS—"Again, the movement withdrew from active life * * * * * * many of the choicest spirits of the age."

Comment—"The monks became missionaries;" "they also became teachers;" "they became copyists;" "they became agriculturists;" "they became the almoners of the pious and wealthy." "Everywhere the monasteries opened their hospitable doors to the weary, the sick and the discouraged." "These retreats were the inns, and the hospitals, as well as the schools of learning and the nurseries of religion of mediæval Europe." These quotations are all taken from the previous article, indicted by Mr. Myers himself, and they show that while monasticism withdrew men from the wickedness of the world, it did not withdraw them from an active life for the world.

MYERS—"The monastic orders contributed to the building up of the colossal power of the Papacy."

Comment—The monastic orders contributed nothing to the building up of the Papacy, or even to the support of the Papacy; for the Papacy, perfectly built up, was conferred by Christ upon St. Peter; and ever since has been supported by divine power. They simply contrib-

uted to the popular recognition of the divine institution, and obedience to it.

MYERS—"The Papacy, which enchained the temporal princes of Europe."

Comment—In the servitude of the Gospel. This we readily admit.

Conclusion.—

MYERS—"The adoption of a common faith set in the midst of the seething, martial nations and races of Europe an influence that fostered the gentler virtues, and a power that was always to be found on the side of order, and usually of mercy."

Comment—"And usually of mercy." The author seems quite incapable of composing a really good sentence without attaching to it some word or phrase, which like a wart on the nose, disfigures the whole beauty. The Church has always been on the side of both order and mercy. The severest measures are often the most merciful.

CHAPTER III.

Fusion of The Latin and Teutonic Peoples.

Introductory.—

Myers—"The Hebrew element, that is, the ideas, beliefs, and sentiments of Christianity."

Comment—The professor, in identifying Judaism with Christianity, repeats the error of the pagan Romans, who confounded the Jews with the Christians; and shows that his knowledge of "metaphysical subtleties" is on a par with theirs and that of the "simple-minded barbarians."

The Barbarians and the Roman Lands.—

The Romance Nations.—

The Formation of the Romance Languages.—

Consequences of the Confusion of Languages.—

The Barbarians and Roman Learning—

The Barbarian Codes.—

Personal Character of the Teutonic Legislation.

Ordeals.—

Comment—So deep-seated and inveterate were the pagan superstitions, and superstitious practices, called ordeals, that the Church was unable to eradicate them at once; but was constrained to practice condescension and

ST. ALBERT'S COLLEGE LIBRARY

forbearance, or give up altogether the education of her recent barbarian converts. She was obliged, now and then, to tolerate, but always with reluctance and sorrow, some of the milder ordeals; but she constantly exerted her influence and authority, even from the beginning, to abolish such as could not be practiced without imminent danger to the life of the contestants, and to substitute for them the sworn testimony of witnesses. It is not impossible that religious disputes, even concerning the liturgy, may have been tried in this way by private individuals; nor impossible, either, that corporations had legal defenders of their rights as we have sheriffs. Wherever the Church succeeded in introducing a trial by sworn testimony in place of the bloody ordeals, she generally took charge of the case, herself. But we are surprised to find our author condemning the clergy for interfering in the bloody ordeals, and by the employment of "devices and tricks," saving the innocent, and perhaps the guilty, too, from unjust and horrible punishment. The author again evinces pitiable ignorance of "metaphysical subtleties" in confounding these superstitious and barbarous practices with the divinely instituted trials of the Old Testament.

The Revival of the Roman Law.—

CHAPTER IV.

The Roman Empire In The East.

The Era of Justinian.—

The Conquest of Africa.—

Myers—"The Vandals became furious persecutors of the professors of the Athanasian Creed."

Comment—We suppose that he will hang on to that title until he dies. Please, sir, call us Catholics.

The Conquest of Italy.—

The Fate of Belisarius. —

Rebuilding of the Church of St. Sophia.—

The Defenses of the Empire.—

Introduction of Silk Manufacture.—

The Code of Justinian.—

Closing of the Schools of Athens.—

Myers—"It was during the reign of Justinian that the schools of rhetoric and philosophy at Athens were closed by imperial edict. * * * Their teachings and methods were deemed by Justinian to be unfriendly to Christianity."

Comment—They certainly deserved to be closed.

Myers—"They set reason before faith."

Comment—The author has a very loose and unphilosophical way of writing. "They," the Athenian schools, or rather their professors, "set reason before faith," and

therefore were they condemned. So says the author. Now, did the professors err? Not if by "before" they meant priority of time, for reason is antecedent to faith. But if by "before" they meant more necessary, they erred, for reason and faith are equally necessary. And if by "before" they meant pre-eminence, they also erred, for in excellence, reason is secondary. The latter error was theirs.

Myers—"These seven friends,—Diogenes, Hermias, etc., resolved to seek in Persia freedom of thought."

Comment—They were poor philosophers if they judged that freedom of thought consisted in thinking error. Ignorance is the only slavery of which the mind is capable. They were also poor philosophers if they judged that locality could affect the freedom of thought.

Myers—"But in that distant country the exile philosophers found the Zoroastrian priests quite as intolerant as the Christian bishops."

Comment—The Christian bishops performed a simple and imperative duty in urging the emperor to close a pagan school in the heart of a Catholic nation.

Myers—"They soon returned to Europe, where they lived in silence and died in obscurity."

Comment—And the Christian world was blessed by their departure.

Calamities of Justinian's Reign.—

State of the Empire at the Accession of Heraclius.—

The Expedition of Heraclius.—

The Battle of Nineveh.—

The Approaching Storm.—

The Empire becomes Greek.—

CHAPTER V.

Mohammed and the Saracens.

Origin and Character of the Arabs.—

Religious Condition of Arabia before Mohammed.—

Myers—"Arabia at this time, in happy and reproving contrast to almost every other country, was a land of religious freedom."

Comment—A religion that cares not what a neighbor believes or professes, is devoid of charity. Charity, the characteristic of the true religion, is more solicitous that men have the truth than that they have food, raiment and shelter: and believing that it possesses the truth, will be unwilling that the contrary errors should be preached. Much that Mr. Myers praises as religious tolerance, is infidel indifference.

Myers—"Hence, religious exiles from every land fled thither as to an asylum."

Comment—Arabia would have been a fit place for the "seven friends." Here they would have been free to persist in their errors, spout infidelity and bad philosophy, and pervert others.

Myers—"Mohammed, the great prophet of the Arabs, was born in the holy city of Mecca."

Comment—Mohammed was not a prophet, nor was Mecca a holy city. Our author is a Mohammedan among Mohammedans, a pagan among pagans, and a chameleon

everywhere. This may be very convenient, and very respectable, but it does not bespeak the stuff of which heroes are made. We doubt that had he lived in the days of Nero or Diocletian, he would have been martyred for the faith.

MYERS—"It is probable that Mohammed was subject to such illusions of sights and sounds—a not uncommon disorder of the mind—as caused Joan of Arc to believe that she was commissioned by heaven to effect the deliverance of her country."

Comment—This statement is the ripe fruit of self-conceit, incredulity, and impiety. We think that Mr. Myers is the last man in the world capable of appreciating the character and deeds of the saintly heroine of Arc; and he betrays the grossness of his mind by comparing the inspirations of the devout child with the delusions and forgeries of the sensual Arab. Whatever else a man writes, he always writes himself.

The Hegira.—

MYERS—"The teachings of Mohammed at last aroused the anger of a powerful party among the Koreishites, * * * * * and accordingly plots were formed against his life."

Comment—This is the Arabia which, we have just been told, "was a land of religious freedom," and where exiles found "a toleration that they sought in vain elsewhere." The infidel Arabians were indifferent, not tolerant, which is very evident from their speedy recourse to plots of death so soon as they perceived their material interests endangered. We mention here this mistake

of the author, and dwell upon it, for he pursues the phantom through the entire book.

The Faith Extended by the Sword.—

MYERS—"The year following the Hegira Mohammed began to attack and plunder caravans."

Comment—Plundering has ever marked the introduction and propagation of false worship. The pagans persecuted that they might confiscate; and the Reformers always appealed to, and gratified, some worldly passion.

MYERS—"There is nothing like the religious transformation of the Arab race in all history, save that wonderful inspiration of the Hebrew nation on that eventful night spent in the face of their enemy on the shores of the Red Sea."

Comment—Mr. Myers should read the Old Testament, and try to understand at least the plain narrative it contains. It was not the inspiration, wonderful or otherwise, of the Hebrew nation, that led them out of Egypt, but the command of God, plainly delivered to them by Moses.

Mohammed's Embassies to Heraclius and Chosroes.—

The Death of the Prophet.—

MYERS—"Mohammed expired in the arms of his faithful wife Ayesha, his last words being, 'Yes, I come among my companions on high.'"

Comment—Presumption is characteristic of infidelity and heresy the world over. You will hear heretics to-day talking with the same insolent assurance of their future beatitude.

The Character of Mohammed.—

MYERS—"There seems little doubt that Mohammed was the subject of some bodily or mental disorder. His conduct during all the earlier portion of his career can be satisfactorily explained upon no other view."

Comment—There is another explanation—diabolic possession. We admit, however, that this view will have few attractions for a man who stigmatizes belief in "divine interpositions," as superstition; and who has perhaps even less faith, if possible, in angels and devils.

The Koran.—

The Doctrines of the Koran.—

Abubekr, First Successor of Mohammed.—

The Conquest of Syria.—

The Conquest of Persia.—

MYERS—"Arabian tradition declares that the triumph of Islam over the religion of Zoroaster was foreshadowed by a miracle on the night that Mohammed was born."

Comment—If we must have barbarian tradition let it be that which has some foundation in fact.

Conquests in Central Asia.—

The Conquest of Egypt.—

Comment—The author dwells at some length and with considerable force, on the sufferings endured by the Egyptian Copts because of their departure from the true Church and their adoption of the Jacobite heresy. Whatever persecutions and monetary exactions they may have

endured from the officers of the Eastern Empire, they have never been persecuted by the Church, whose constant and universal practice has been the reclaiming of the errant by instruction and kindness. Wherever the Church has departed from mild methods, it has been in restraining the sowers of pestilential doctrines among the faithful, and the stubborn perpetrators of crimes against social order.

As to the fanatical hostility of Bishop Theophilus to everything classical,—no Catholic bishop has ever attacked the classics because they were classics, but because they are infidel.

The Caliphs Othman and Ali.—

The Establishment of the Dynasty of the Ommiades.—

Myers—"With Ali perished the truest-hearted and best Moslem of whom Mohammedan history has preserved remembrance."

Comment—Yet it often happens that the best of the worst is not superior to the worst of the best. A Moslem, if true to the Koran, is a moral pest; if false to it, a contemptible hypocrite.

The Conquest of Northern Africa.—

Myers—"The long and desperate struggle was illustrated, as were all the campaigns of the Arabs, by surprising exploits of valor and splendid examples of religious zeal."

Comment—To call the fanaticism of the Arabs, religious zeal, is to cast a slur upon a great Christian virtue. We know that devils, as well as angels, can fight; but we do not call their wrath religious zeal.

Attacks upon Constantinople.—

The Conquest of Spain.—

Invasion of France: Battle of Tours.—

MYERS—"The marvelous success that had everywhere attended the Moslem arms justified at once their faith in the inspiration of their prophet and the divine nature of their commission."

Comment—If Mr. Myers believes this statement true, he has no right to condemn the pagans' ordeals as superstitions. They simply justified their cause by successful battle. Besides, the author ridicules "divine interpositions."

The Moslem's military triumphs did not justify their faith in either Mohammed's inspiration, or the divine nature of their commission. An evident miracle, alone, could warrant either, and that they had not. They had witnessed no manifest fulfillment of any prophecy of Mohammed; nor could their military success be proved to be either miraculous, or a divine approval of their undertaking, or an assurance of its successful issue.

It is unfortunate that when the author indulges in wild statements he should be so reckless of their moral influence.

Beginning of the Dynasty of the Abbassides.—

The Golden Age of the Caliphate.—

The Dismemberment of the Caliphate.—

Spread of the Religion and Language of the Arabs.—

MYERS—"The African Church, which had given birth to a Cyprian and an Augustine, and which for centuries

preceding the Saracen conquest, had been most powerful in wealth, learning, and confessors, gradually fell away."

Comment—The contamination of Moslem association was so deadening to virtue; and the social atmosphere was so infected with error and immorality, that it was well-nigh impossible for the Christian religion to exist.

The Defects of Islam.—

MYERS—"The first fruits of Islam might well have led one to regard it as a faith favorable to civilization."

Comment—No Christian could have been so deceived. Neither the first fruits of Islam, nor its last fruits, could have led him to regard it as a faith and worship favorable to civilization. Error cannot be favorable to any good thing, or any normal development. The knowledge that Islam was false would save a Christian from the author's blunder.

MYERS—"Civilization certainly owes a large debt to the Saracens."

Comment—To the Saracens civilization owes something, very likely; but not to their pestiferous religion. And to what nation does not civilization owe something? But as to the greatness of our debt to the Saracens, Osborn condemns the judgment of Myers, and calls it a "grievous error." Islam, about the Christian civilization of Constantinople and Spain, he compares to dark clouds about the sun, reflecting but not originating light.

MYERS—"Islam shuts up woman in the harem, and thus deprives all classes of the elevating and refining influences of social intercourse."

Comment—The society of the Mohammedan women, incarcerated in harems, would have exerted no "elevating

and refining influence," had they remained at large. The influence of pagan women on barbarous and semi-civilized society has not been ennobling. The chief blot upon Islamism is not that it urges or forces women to retire from society, but that its end in so doing is polygamy, a sin against the Sixth Commandment.

CHAPTER VI.

Charlemagne and the Restoration of the Empire in the West.

General Remarks.—

Myers—"We shall tell how the Mayors of the Palace of the Merovingian princes became the actual kings of the Franks, and how in this matter the Bishops of Rome established a precedent of far-reaching influence for deposing and setting up kings."

Comment—The Pope is the Vicar of Christ, the fountain of justice, and the head of spiritual authority in the world. When he crowns a king, the act is a certificate of the justice of the king's claim, and of the validity of the coronation; and when he pronounces a throne forfeited by tyranny, the subjects may feel assured that they are freed from allegiance to the deposed monarch.

How Duke Pepin Became King of the Franks.—

Myers—"Pope Zacharias, mindful of recent favors which he had received at the hands of Pepin, gave his approval to the proposed scheme by replying that it seemed altogether reasonable that one who was king in power should be king also in name."

Comment—Pope Zachary, in giving his decision in favor of Pepin, did so with strict regard to the legal aspects of the question; alleging as his reason that the electoral vote of the nobles of the Germanic Kingdom should be respected, and the fact that Pepin had, in reality if not in name, possessed and exercised the royal authority

in the Frankish Kingdom for years. Little Myers says that the Pope was mindful of recent favors which he had received at the hands of Pepin, from which he concludes that the decision was influenced by them, just as a decision rendered by himself might depend on the amount of boodle forthcoming. Thank God, Pope Zachary was not that kind of a man.

MYERS—"The part taken by the Pope in this important matter * * * * was afterwards magnified and made a precedent * * * * for deposing for heresy or misrule the temporal princes of the earth."

Comment—The insinuation contained in the word "magnified" is very Myersish. By whom was the papal part magnified? Upon investigation the author will discover his inability to answer the question. The Pope by virtue of his office is authorized to determine when the right to a throne has been forfeited. By reason of his indifference, inability, and neglect, Chilperic had certainly merited deposition.

Pepin Gives the Pope Lands Retaken From the Lombards.—

MYERS—"Pepin often passed beyond the limits of the country upon various military enterprises, always cloaking his ambition under the pretense of a desire to advance the interests of the Church."

Comment—It is not our business to inquire into the conscience of Pepin, nor to determine whether the ostensible motive of his military enterprises was real or feigned; but we are inclined to view with incredulity the assertion that his desire to advance the interests of the

Church was mere pretense. We find no authority for the statement.

MYERS—"Pepin probably did not intend to convey to the Papal See the absolute sovereignty of the transferred lands."

Comment—Pepin probably intended to do what he did; he publicly and explicitly declared that he donated to the Church the cities and country which he had taken from the Lombards. Therefore rightly did the Popes claim and exercise authority over the ceded territory.

Accession of Charlemagne.—

His Campaigns.—

MYERS—"The Pope refusing to do as king Desiderius desired, the barbarian threatened to seize his little territory, and was proceeding to carry out his threat, when the Pope appealed for aid to his friend Charlemagne. The king at once marched into Italy, wrested from Desiderius all his possessions, shut up the unfortunate king in a monastery, and placed on his own head the famous iron crown of the Lombards."

Comment—A monastery makes the most humane prison imaginable; for it affords considerable freedom, social enjoyment, and spiritual advantage.

MYERS—"The Saxons were fighting not only for their homes, but for their religion; * * * yet the Frankish king seemed to deem it a duty and merit, if not a privilege, to employ his sword in driving the pagans within the fold of the Church."

Comment—Is it the blindness of pride, the stubbornness of perversity, or gross ignorance, that keeps our au-

thor from seeing the truth? The Catholic Church forbids that infidels should be forced within the fold; but she commends the employment of arms, as a last resort, to break the power of pagan governments, civil and religious, and set free the idolaters, "who sit in darkness and in the shadow of the valley of death."

MYERS—"Witikind at last yielded, threw himself on the mercy of Charlemagne, was kindly treated, received the communion of baptism, and ended his life in a monastery."

Comment—We are curious to learn what kind of communion is "communion of baptism." The author is fully as ignorant of the Church as of the Bible.

Restoration of the Empire in the West.—

MYERS—"As Charlemagne was participating in the festivities of Christmas Day in the Cathedral of St. Peter at Rome, the Pope approached the kneeling King, * * * and placing a crown of gold upon his head, proclaimed him emperor of the Romans, and the rightful and consecrated successor of Cæsar Augustus and Constantine."

Comment—This is pure fiction. Pope Leo III. did not crown Charlemagne "Emperor of the West," and Charlemagne never assumed or bore the title; neither did he crown him "Emperor of the Holy Roman Empire." All the Pope did was to raise the Patrician or Protector to the imperial dignity; but he conferred on him no authority out of the Papal States. Neither did the coronation take place in the Cathedral of St. Peter. St. Peter's Church is not a cathedral. The Roman cathedral is St. John Lateran.

Charlemagne's Death; His Character and Work.—

MYERS—"The murder of his Saxon prisoners was a most atrocious crime, which will ever leave a dark stain upon the name of the great Frankish king. Neither was his domestic life unspotted, and this alone prevented his being placed on the regular Roman calendar of the saints."

Comment—Not the least remarkable thing about this book is the presumption and audacity with which its author speaks. Is it not a little strange that a writer who seems at times quite incapable of truthfully recording what the Church has actually done, should venture to predict what she would have done under other circumstances?

Division of the Empire; Treaty of Verdun.—

MYERS—"In Lewis Debonair the vigorous piety of Charlemagne had degenerated into the nerveless devotion of the monk."

Comment—The ancestral piety of our author's family, if it had any, has evidently degenerated into the sneering conceit of the infidel.

Conclusion.—

CHAPTER VII.

The Northmen.

I. Introductory.

The People and the Northern Lands.—

The Northmen as Pirates and Colonizers.—

Causes of the Migration.—

Settlements in Scotland, Ireland, and the Western Isles.—

Colonization of Iceland and Greenland.—

The Saga Literature of Iceland.—

Myers—"About the year 1090 a Christian clergyman, Saemund Sigfussen by name—Iceland had by this time given up its pagan faith—collected the poems then floating among the people."

Comment—"Christian clergyman" in Iceland before the Reformation was another name for Catholic priest. Saemund Sigfussen, the father of Icelandic literature, was a Catholic priest; a member of that Church which preserved literature, law, science, civilization and Christianity, throughout the Dark Ages.

The Norsemen in Russia.—

The Varangians at Constantinople.—

II. The Danes In England.

Their Ravages in the Island.—

King Alfred and the Danes.—

Alfred's Works of Peace.—

His Character.—

MYERS—"Alfred was the noblest as he was the most complete embodiment of all that is great, all that is lovable, in the English temper."

Comment—King Alfred the Great was popularly regarded as a saint; and the Church that honors him, first sanctified him, and made him worthy of the gratitude and encomiums of men.

The Danish Conquest of England.—

MYERS—"Never did the sorely harassed English have more urgent need to pray the petition of the Litany of those days: 'From the fury of the Northmen, Good Lord, deliver us.'"

Comment—It is most probable that the above petition never appeared in the Litany of the Saints, for the old petition answered well the purpose: "From plague, famine, and war, O Lord, deliver us."

The Reign of Canute.—

Restoration of the English Line.—

Results of the Danish Conquest.—

MYERS—"The great benefit which resulted to England from the Danish conquest was the infusion of fresh blood into the veins of the English people, who through contact with the half-Romanized Celts, and especially through the enervating influence of a monastic Church, had lost much of that bold, masculine vigor which characterized their hardy ancestors."

Comment—Mr. Myers has a holy horror of monasteries and what he calls the "monastic Church." He declares that they enervate the "masculine vigor," whatever that is, of the hardy people, by long prayers. We presume that he speaks out of the fullness of his heart, and that the private oratory on College Hill is seldom visited lest his professorial boldness and "masculine vigor" should be enervated. But did he ever reflect that Canute and his bold followers who conferred "the great benefit of infusing fresh blood into the veins of the English people" had themselves come from Denmark where the "monastic Church" had long been established? Has he forgotten that Charles Martel and the Franks who hammered the Saracens out of shape at Tours had tempered their weapons at the forges of the "monastic Church?"

III. Settlement of the Northmen in Gaul.

Rollo and Charles the Simple.—

Transformation of the Northmen.—

CHAPTER VIII.

Rise of the Papal Power.

Introduction.—

Myers—"We propose in the present chapter to trace the series of circumstances whereby the Christian Church, a simple democratic society at the outset, was gradually changed into a great monarchy, with the Bishop of Rome as its head."

Comment—Who or what is the author's authority for the statement that the "Christian Church" was "at the outset a simple democratic society?" Only his precious private judgment, and that of a few other visionaries. Let us consider the value of their opinion. Were a stranger to seek information on the original constitution of the United States government, what would he do? Would he take an opiate and invite dreams? Would he consult a Chinese philosopher, or a Spanish politician? Certainly not. He would apply to an American citizen, educated under our government; and if the information he received were not sufficiently full and precise, he would consult a United States Justice of the Supreme Court, whose office requires that he be thoroughly conversant with the origin, history and nature of our government. Now, Mr. Myers has often asserted that the primitive Church was the Roman Catholic Church. This Church is in existence everywhere to-day, and it must certainly know its own history. The Supreme Court of the Church is the Pope of Rome. Now, for Mr. Myers to deny the teaching of this supreme authority, declaring the original

nature of the Church's government, and hatch a conflicting theory of his own, is to make himself a laughing stock for all men possessed of brains. The fact is that the Catholic Church never was "a simple democratic society," nor did it ever change "into a great monarchy." If the unblushing insolence or puerile ignorance that fabricates and then proclaims contrary theories constitute "bold and masculine vigor," the sooner the author comes under the influence of the "monastic Church" and is "enervated," the better for the cause of history, and his reputation for sanity.

MYERS—"It must be borne in mind that the Bishops of Rome put forth a double claim, namely, that they were the supreme head of the Church, and also the rightful, divinely appointed suzerain of all temporal princes, the 'earthly King of Kings.' "

Comment—The Bishops of Rome have always claimed that they were the head of the Church; but no Pope has ever claimed to be a suzerain, or feudal lord, by divine appointment; yet they have often acted, by international compact, or on the selection of the disputants, as arbiters in royal disputes. They have, too, by virtue of their supreme spiritual power, sometimes pronounced subjects freed from their allegiance to tyrants who had grossly and persistently abused their authority; and they have claimed and exercised, as rulers of the Papal States, authority over their own secular ministers. The justice of these claims, and the legality of these powers, the Catholic is able and ready to vindicate.

MYERS—"Their temporal power was shattered by the revolt of the kings and princes of Europe in the fourteenth century."

Comment—Obedience to their supreme spiritual authority, whereby the Popes sought to enforce the commandments of God in the temporal administration of the several states of Europe, and in international affairs, was refused by some ambitious and tyrannical monarchs in the fourteenth century.

MYERS—"And their spiritual authority was destroyed in the countries of Northern Europe by the revolt of the people in the sixteenth."

Comment—Authority is not destroyed by a refusal of the subject to acknowledge it. A father retains his parental authority whether the child yield or refuse compliance with it. The rebel angels did not destroy the authority of God by rebellion and infernal exile. What is the matter with the professor that he has lost the power to reason?

The Organization of the Church.—

MYERS—"The Christian Church seems to have been at first a simple association rather than an organization."

Comment—It was neither a simple association nor an organization. The Catholic Church is and always has been an organism. "I am the vine; you are the branches," is the simile which Christ chose to express the vital relation between himself and the faithful; and even Mr. Myers should be able to understand that a vine with its branches is more than an association or organization. His attempt to explain the constitution of the Church is like the effort of the jackdaw to carry off the ram.

MYERS—"Pre-eminence was conferred by character rather than by office."

Comment—So it was because of his sublime character that the pre-eminence of the apostleship was conferred on Judas! What a pity Myers did not write a theology!

MYERS—"But very early in its history it became an organized body, with regular gradations of officers, such as presbyters, bishops, metropolitans, and patriarchs."

Comment—It was at so early a period of its history that it had had no prior history. Christ himself instituted the priesthood and the episcopate, the offices of presbyters or priests, and bishops.

MYERS—"We must bear in mind that the Roman patriarchs were also metropolitans and bishops, the functions of these lower offices as well as those of the higher being exercised by them."

Comment—What distinguishes metropolitans and patriarchs from bishops is merely more extensive ecclesiastical jurisdiction. The episcopate, however, is a dignity and office conferred by Holy Orders, and is superior to any ecclesiastical jurisdiction, howsoever extensive.

Primacy of the Bishop of Rome.—

MYERS—"It is maintained by some that the patriarchs at first had equal and co-ordinate powers."

Comment—Yes, it is maintained by some whose opinion is not worth the ink that expresses it.

MYERS—"But others claim that the Bishop of Rome from the very first was regarded as above the others in dignity and authority, and as the divinely appointed head of the visible Church on earth."

Comment—He is the divinely appointed visible head of the Church on earth.

MYERS—"Even as Christ is the spiritual head of the Church invisible."

Comment—Who said so? Christ is the invisible head of the visible Church; and the Pope is Christ's Vicar and the visible head of the visible Church. We hope that this distinction is not too metaphysically subtle for the Sage of College Hill.

MYERS—"However this may be, the Pontiffs of Rome began very early to claim supremacy over all other bishops and patriarchs."

Comment—Yes, right from the start.

MYERS—"By the beginning of the fifth century the Roman Bishops had very nearly made good their claim."

Comment—Yes, four hundred years before that time they had made their claim entirely good.

MYERS—"But probably Pope Gregory the Great * * * * * was the earliest Roman Bishop to whom the title of Pope, in the modern sense of the word, should be applied."

Comment—Pray, what is the modern sense of the word? Oh, would that some kind nurse would put a bib and tucker on this infant, and lead him to the kindergarten!

Advantage to the Roman Bishops of the Fall of the Empire.—

MYERS—"The ambitions and claims of the Roman Bishops were greatly favored from the very first by the spell in which the world was held by the name and prestige of imperial Rome."

Comment—However, had the Papal claims been invalid, the Papacy would have suffered from residence in the imperial city. The visible contrast in pomp, wealth, and material power, between the secular and ecclesiastical authority would have been to its disadvantage.

MYERS—"The removal by Constantine of the seat of government to the Bosphorus, instead of diminishing the power and dignity of the Roman Bishops, tended powerfully to promote their claims and authority."

Comment—This is powerful reasoning; both the presence and the absence of the imperial dignity promoted the Pope's claims. Here is the problem mathematically presented and solved:—2 plus 2 equals 4, and 2 minus 2 equals 4. Myers.

MYERS—"And when the barbarians came, there came another occasion for the Roman Bishops to increase their influence."

Comment—Unparalleled logic! Because the Pope was protected by the emperor, his authority grew; and because he was unprotected and exposed to danger, it still grew. 2 plus 2 equals 4, and 2 minus 2 equals 4. Myers.

MYERS—"Rome's extremity was their opportunity. * * * * Innocent I., through his intercession, saved the churches of Rome * * * and * * * * * through the intercession of the pious Leo the Great the fierce Attila was persuaded to turn back and spare the imperial city. * * * * The unarmed Pastor was able, through the awe and reverence inspired by his holy office, to render services that could not but result in bringing increased honor and dignity to the Roman See."

Comment—Will Mr. Myers please explain why the fierce barbarians reverenced the Supreme Pontiffs, and

granted their petitions? The truth should be told even though uncomplimentary to the author:—the savages discerned in the Vicar of Christ what he fails to perceive, a representative of the Most High God.

MYERS—"But if the misfortunes of Rome tended to the enhancement of the reputation and influence of the Roman Bishops, much more did the final downfall of the capital tend to the same end."

Comment—Verily the authority that stands firm amidst temporal prosperity and temporal adversity, amidst social order and its ruin, must be divine. "Thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my Church."

MYERS—"Upon the surrender of the Sovereignty of the West into the hands of the Emperor of the East, the Bishops of Rome became the most important persons in Western Europe."

Comment—They did not become, for they always were, "the most important;" and not only in the West, but also in the East, and North, and South. The Vicar of Christ is the most important person in the world.

The Missions of Rome.—

MYERS—"In the Council of Frankfort, held in 742, the Bishops of Gaul and Germany resolved that the Metropolitans or Archbishops of the Gallic and German churches should receive the pallium from the hands of the Pope, in token of their subjection and allegiance to the Roman See."

Comment—There was no Council of Frankfort held in the year 742; hence no decree was promulgated by it. Some years later a synod of the Franks made a rule that

metropolitans should ask the pallium from Rome; but they did not order that they should receive it, for the conferring of the pallium is a Papal prerogative. We would advise our professor to be very careful in the selection of material in the construction of his theoretical Papal edifice, lest the whole structure fall before completion and bury in its ruins the reputation of the architect.

MYERS—"Gregory II., writing the Eastern Emperor, could say that to the people of Western Europe the very statue of the founder of the Roman Church seemed 'a god upon earth.'"

Comment—Any high-school scholar could translate Pope Gregory's letter correctly. The pope says that St. Peter was honored as a terrestrial god, for he exercised the delegated powers of God.

War of the Iconoclasts.—

MYERS—"Even long before the seventh century * * * * * * Christianity had lost very much of its early simplicity and purity."

Comment—We deny the charge, and challenge the author to produce proofs.

MYERS—"The churches both in the East and in the West were crowded with images or pictures of the apostles, saints, and martyrs."

Comment—As was proper. The images of the Christian heroes should be in the Christian temple. What harm does the professor see in that?

MYERS—"To the ignorant classes at least they were objects of adoration and worship."

Comment—It is very doubtful that any Catholic ever adored an image; though heretics, devoid of an authoritative teaching church, might fall into the error. The Catholic Church always insists upon Christian education, which should continue not only during attendance at the parish school; but an hour or more, on every Sunday throughout life, should be devoted to progress in Christian knowledge. Catholics appreciate the treasure of Christian doctrine in the ratio that they understand it.

MYERS—"They were believed to possess miraculous virtues and powers."

Comment—But did Balaam's ass possess no miraculous powers? Did Aaron's rod bud and blossom according to the natural laws that govern sticks? And did the waters of the Jordan contain no miraculous virtue for Naaman, the Syrian? Why should not God now effect miracles through the medium of unreasoning creatures? He can and does; but no Catholic ever believed that the miracle was wrought by the creature.

MYERS—"The images of apostles and saints were found powerless to protect even their own shrines."

Comment—Catholics have always believed that images are powerless.

MYERS—"The feeling awakened among the Eastern Christians by these disasters was precisely the same as that aroused among the pagan inhabitants of the Roman Empire, when, amidst the calamities of the barbarian invasion, the ancient deities were found powerless."

Comment—Fudge!

MYERS—"The Christians were filled with shame and confusion."

Comment—They were filled with sorrow and horror at the desecration of their temples. It is our modern Christian school-children who study Myers' history, who are filled with shame and confusion at the humiliating necessity which constrains them to read the book.

MYERS—"A strong party arose, * * * Iconoclasts. They were the Reformers of the East."

Comment—And worthy precursors of the Reformers, or Deformers, of the West. But what did they reform? Nothing. Ignorant and inconstant, in less than a century, they restored the images to the empty niches in their churches.

The Donation of Constantine and the False Decretals.—

MYERS—"The ambitious pretensions of the Roman Pontiffs were just about this time greatly furthered by two of the most surprising and successful forgeries in all history."

Comment—An author who has just admitted his inability to disprove the papal claims, has no right to call them "ambitious pretensions." Forgery is a mild name for the sin. We readily admit that Isidore was an adroit forger, and perhaps second to none in his day. The professor had not yet appeared on the scene.

MYERS—"The object of the former was to support and justify the donation of Pepin and Charlemagne."

Comment—Which needed no justification, being justified in itself.

MYERS—"The False Decretals are now acknowledged by all scholars, Catholic as well as Protestant, to have been forged."

Comment—They were forged by Isidore, whose identity is not known. His purpose seems to have been to emphasize, not magnify, the appellate power of the Pope, in order that all ecclesiastics who felt themselves aggrieved by a lower court, might have recourse to him. The Decretals, however, have never been approved by Rome.

MYERS—"Nevertheless they did their work as effectively as though genuine."

Comment—What work did they do? They introduced no new doctrine, no new discipline. The Decretals were made up of canons, laws, and writings of the Fathers of the fourth and fifth centuries; and it is precisely because the doctrines they inculcated were true and not new, though the facts they alleged were fictitious, that the forgery remained so long undiscovered, and its introduction created no opposition.

MYERS—"It is difficult to believe what is, notwithstanding, a fact," * * *.

Comment—It is not a fact, but what in plain English is called a lie.

MYERS—"That the great fabric of the mediaeval Papacy rested very largely upon so unsubstantial a basis as these forged papers."

Comment—It rested on the rock whereon Christ promised he would build his Church.

Ecclesiastical Jurisdiction; Appeals to Rome.—

MYERS—"The disorders and violence of the feudal period that followed the break-up of the empire of Charlemagne, afforded another chance to the Papal See

* * * * * * * * * for the further extension and consolidation of its influence and power."

Comment—Here the author reveals the meanness of his nature. He sees nothing disinterested in the Church's heroic labor for the civilization of the barbarian, and the Christianization of the heathen; nothing admirable in her love of justice, and her efforts to promote justice among the nations; nothing noble in her solicitude for the weak and oppressed. By his mind every virtue is distorted; he sees only selfish ambition, "schemes of usurpation," and the employment of dishonest methods.

MYERS—"Even the right to try all criminal cases was claimed on the ground that all crime is sin."

Comment—"Was claimed!" By whom was it claimed? By the Pope? No. By a council, general, national, provincial, or diocesan? No. By whom was it claimed? By a Father or Doctor of the Church, or by any eminent theologian? Never. By whom, then? Well, it was claimed! And thus this stupendous "His-story-teller," this redoubtable "Knight of the Quill," hides himself under the coat-tails of "It was claimed," and tries to asperse the fair garments of the Church with foul ink.

MYERS—"The temporal princes, not perceiving whither this thing tended, at first favored this extension of ecclesiastical jurisdiction."

Comment—The temporal princes were human beings, and their vision was probably restricted to things seeable. They did not see monsters where there were no monsters.

MYERS—"Thus, for a single illustration, in 857 Charles the Bald of France ordered that all thieves, murderers, and other criminals, should be tried by the bishops,

and upon conviction handed over to the courts for punishment."

Comment—And this he did because, as Mr. Myers has said, learning was confined to the ecclesiastics; and he did not want his subjects to be tried by incompetent judges.

MYERS—"Now the particular feature of this enormous extension of the jurisdiction of the Church tribunals which at present it especially concerns us to notice, is the establishment of the principle that all cases might be appealed or cited from the courts of the bishops and archbishops of the different European countries to the Papal See."

Comment—The bishops appointed by Charles the Bald to try thieves, murderers, and other criminals, served as ministers of the temporal power, and did not constitute an ecclesiastical tribunal from whose decision an appeal might be taken to Rome.

MYERS—"The Pope thus came to be regarded as the fountain of justice."

Comment—But as the premises were false, the conclusion is false, and the author is obliged to seek another origin of the papal title, "Fountain of Justice." The Pope was so called because divinely appointed the custodian, interpreter, teacher, and applier, of the revealed law, to kings and to people.

The Papacy and the Empire.—

Comment—Mr. Myers is altogether incompetent to understand and discuss the very difficult question of the relation to each other of the temporal and spiritual power,

or the relation of Church and State. We may briefly say that the State has the divine right to govern in accordance with the laws of God, of which the Church is the custodian and interpreter. In the State's divine right to govern, she is dependent on God alone; but in her duty to accept the law of God as proposed and interpreted by the Church, she is dependent upon, and inferior to, the Church. This is the ideal order, and the true relation. In this country where the true relation of Church and State is not recognized, the government acknowledges no obligation to receive the law from the Church, though it generally rules in conformity with her teaching.

SECOND PERIOD—The Age of Revival.

CHAPTER I.

Feudalism and Chivalry.

I. Feudalism.

Feudalism Defined.—

The Ideal System.—

Myers—"According to papal theorists it was the Pope who, as God's vicar on earth, had the right to pronounce judgment against a king, depose him, and put another in his place."

Comment—We congratulate our author on having for once stated the Catholic doctrine substantially correct. It is the right of the Vicar of Christ to determine when an abuse of royal power has operated its forfeiture.

Myers—"The King in receiving his fief was entrusted with sovereignty over all persons living upon it * * * * * their absolute and irresponsible ruler."

Comment—This is not strictly true. In spiritual things he was responsible to the Pope. The fallacy of "absolute and irresponsible" sovereignty was reserved for heresy, which in Germany, England, Russia and elsewhere, made the monarch supreme ruler in both spirituals and temporals, head of the nation and head of the Church, custodian of the conscience and purse of the subject, "absolute and irresponsible."

Myers—"To illustrate the workings of the feudal system, we will suppose the king or suzerain to be in need of an army. He calls upon his own immediate vassals for aid; these in turn call upon their vassals; and so the order runs down through the various stages of the hierarchy."

Comment—We have recommended to the author the study of the child's catechism; we now add to that recommendation the careful perusal of the English dictionary. He will there find that the feudal system was not a hierarchy. A hierarchy is a government by ecclesiastics.

Roman and Teutonic Elements in the System.—

Myers—"The spirit of feudalism was barbarian, but the form was classical. We might illustrate the idea we are trying to convey, by referring to the mediaeval papal church. It, while Hebrew in spirit, was Roman in form."

Comment—There are some illustrations that obfuscate. The illustration in this case is especially unfortunate, for the mediaeval papal Church was not Hebrew in spirit, but Christian; not Roman in form, but residence.

The Origin of Fiefs.—

Origin of the Feudal Patronage.—

Origin of the Feudal Sovereignty.—

The Ceremony of Homage.—

The Relations of Lord and Vassal.—

Development of the Feudal System.—

Classes of Feudal Society.—

Castles of the Nobles.—

Sports of the Nobles; Hunting and Hawking.—

MYERS—"Abbots and bishops entered upon the chase with as great zeal as the lay nobles. Even the prohibitions of the Church councils against the clergy's indulging in such worldly amusements were wholly ineffectual."

Comment—We would remind the author that temperance, even in speech, is a virtue. The prohibitions of the Church councils, when directed to the clergy, have never been "wholly ineffectual," though they have not always been wholly effectual. It should also be borne in mind that hunting and hawking are not sinful diversions, even for the clergy; and that only when tumultuous, were they forbidden.

The fact that the Archbishop of York went hunting, or that a pack of hounds followed him as he made the visitation of the parishes of his archdiocese, does not prove that hunting and hawking was a universal practice of the clergy.

Causes of the Decay of Feudalism.—

Extinction of Feudalism in Different Countries.—

Defects of the Feudal System.—

Good Results of the System.—

II. CHIVALRY.

Chivalry Defined; Origin of the Institution.—

Its Universality; the Church and Chivalry.—

MYERS—"In the year 1095 the Council of Clermont * * * * decreed that every person of noble birth, on

attaining twelve years of age, should take a solemn oath before the bishop of his diocese 'to defend to the uttermost the oppressed, the widow and orphans; that women of noble birth, both married and single, should enjoy his special care; and that nothing should be wanting in him to rendering traveling safe, and to destroy the evils of tyranny.'"

Comment—The Council of Clermont issued no such decree, and we regard the forgery as very dishonorable to our author. There may, however, have been some civil legislation commanding the reception of Knighthood by young noblemen. There were good reasons why women of noble birth should receive special care; they were most frequently abducted, and forcibly compelled to marry against their will. Their property allured the ambitious and cruel, and its possession was sought through the forcible abduction of its owners.

Training of the Knight.—

The Ceremony of Knighting.—

The Tournament.—

Myers—"Like the contestant in the Olympic games, the aspirant for the honors of the tournament must be unstained by crime."

Comment—The contestants in the Olympic games were not, in a Christian sense, "unstained by crime." They were idolaters, and idolatry is a heinous sin. But if you reply that they were in invincible ignorance, and therefore excusable, I will give you St. Augustine's answer: "Ignorance is either sin, or the punishment of sin." Besides idolatry, they were stained with many gross and

shocking sins committed by participation in the abominable heathen rites. To compare these heathens with the Christian Knights is to stain oneself with a sin against common decency.

Character of the Knight.—

Decline of Chivalry.—

Influence of Chivalry.—

Comment—Dr. Arnold said in his indignation that the spirit of chivalry was the spirit of anti-christ. Another writer, equally indignant, says that the Knights did not know what injustice to the lower classes meant. These are severe accusations. Next comes our author, who declares that, "It is always the young and beautiful lady of gentle birth whose wrongs the valiant Knight is risking his life to avenge;" apparently forgetting that he has already quoted a passage from the oath taken by the Knight, "to defend the oppressed, the widow and orphans." Now, a widow is not always young and beautiful; orphans are generally young, and often homely; and the oppressed are as liable to be men as women.

The Pontificals of the Middle Ages explain the ceremony of Knighting, and direct that the bishop, giving the sword, say, "use it for your defense and that of the Church of God, to the confusion of the enemies of the cross of Christ and the Christian faith:" and again, "Defend the Church, widows, orphans, and the servants of God, against the cruelty of pagans and heretics."

In the face of these proofs, how mean and insipid is the accusation: "It was always the young and beautiful lady of gentle birth whose wrongs the valiant Knight is risking his life to avenge."

MYERS—"Just as Christianity gave to the world an ideal manhood which it was to strive to realize, so did chivalry hold up an ideal to which men were to conform their lives."

Comment—If the author's chivalry is something separate from Christianity, and not a development of Christian principles, it is not only un-christian, but anti-christian: "He that is not with me, is against me," saith the Lord,—as true of principles and movements, as of men. There are some self-constituted teachers, and their name is Legion, for they are many; who preach that Christ, and Moses, and Plato, and Mohammed, and Luther, and others, were benefactors of the race—real Messiasses; each teaching a phase of truth. In the same way do they regard the religious sects: each is a part of the universal Church; each has a fragment of the universal truth; each reflects a ray of light; all are good. To this we reply, that truth is one and integral, and must be taught in its integrity. To teach truth isolated and in fragments, to lay peculiar stress upon one doctrine to the neglect of others, is to sin by both defect and excess, is really to lie, for a lie is a distorted truth. It is the special mission of the teaching Church of Christ to inculcate the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, in its entirety, and its parts in their due relation to the whole and to one another.

CHAPTER II.

The Normans.

I. The Normans at Home and in Italy.

Introductory.—

The Dukes of Normandy.—

The Normans in Italy.—

Myers—"The rule of the Normans in Italy, like that of the Arab-Moors in Spain, gave the subjugated country its most prosperous era. The government was ably and equitably administered. * * * Education was encouraged," etc.

Comment—The author evidently thinks that his readers have very short memories, very poor intellects, and very great credulity. If the students will take the trouble to contrast the above quotation with the following taken from "The Defects of Islam," First Period, Chapter V., they will discover the author's unhappy faculty of contradicting himself: "Many of the tenets of Islam are certainly most unfavorable to human liberty, progress, and improvement. It teaches fatalism, and thus paralyzes the will of man and discourages effort and enterprise. * * * It represses all spiritual aspiration and growth. It consecrates sensuality, and thus sinks its devotees into the lowest degradation. It allows polygamy and puts no restraint upon divorce, and thus destroys the sanctity of the family life. It shuts up woman in the harem.* * *

It promotes slavery, and is the foster parent of despotism. It inspires a bigoted hatred of race and creed. * * * Islam has proved a blight and curse to every race embracing its sterile doctrines." And yet the author says: "The Arab-Moors in Spain gave the subjugated country its most prosperous era." Verily the best way to refute the author is to compare him with himself. The truth is that Islam has no initiative, no inventive power, no progressive spirit, and wherever and whenever left to itself, has intellectually fallen asleep, and morally corrupted. All the progress it ever showed was reflected from surrounding Christian civilization, not originated by itself, as the author almost admits, and the authorities whom he cites, assert.

II. The Norman Conquest of England.

Events Leading up to the Conquest.—

Myers—"Duke William succeeded in securing from the Pope, Alexander II., his blessing upon the enterprise, and the gift of a consecrated banner. The Pope assisted William in his undertaking, in hopes of being in turn aided by him to secure increased power over the English churches."

Comment—Pope Alexander had no need of "increased power over the English churches;" the papal authority was cheerfully obeyed throughout England.

As to the legality of William's claims, and the reasons for the Pope's indorsement of his cause, historical evidence is not explicit; but it is certain that William insisted that Edward had designated him as his successor, and it is well known that Harold had sworn homage to him as heir-apparent to the English crown.

Battle of Stamford Bridge.—

The Battle of Hastings.—

The Completion of the Conquest.—

The Distribution of the Land.—

Domesday Book.—

The Curfew and the Forest Laws.—

Close of William's Reign.—

The Norman Successors of the Conqueror.—

Advantages to England of the Norman Conquest.—

CHAPTER III.

The Crusades.

I. Introductory: Causes of the Crusades.

General Statement.—

Holy Places and Pilgrimages.—

Myers—"Among the early Christians it was thought a pious and meritorious act to undertake a journey to some sacred place."

Comment—As it is an act of fraternal charity to visit a neighbor, so it is an act of piety to visit a sacred place. It was so thought by the early Christians and the late Christians; and not only thought, but known.

Myers—"Prayers, it was believed, were more efficacious when offered on consecrated ground."

Comment—Not necessarily so. However, we think that common sense dictates the propriety of praying in a consecrated place. Would Mr. Myers recommend the race course or wood-shed in preference to a holy place?

Myers—"Tears of repentance shed above the grave of saint or martyr could wash away the stain of the blackest sin."

Comment—The professor is playing the infidel clown act. Tears of true repentance shed anywhere can wash away any sin; yet there may be a choice of place wherein to weep.

MYERS—"Especially was it thought that a pilgrimage to the land that had been trod by the feet of the Saviour of the world * * * was a peculiarly pious undertaking."

Comment—Does any Christian doubt it?

MYERS—"And one which secured for the pilgrim the special favor and blessing of heaven."

Comment—Yes, if piously performed.

MYERS—"Toward the close of the tenth century the almost universal belief founded upon certain passages in the Scriptures, that the world was soon coming to an end, and that Christ was to re-appear in Jerusalem, caused the number of pilgrims to the Holy Land, greatly to increase."

Comment—What the author calls belief, was mere private opinion, not faith. It was not taught by the Church, and was not generally held by the faithful. The opinion, however, is a good illustration of the inability of private judgment to determine the meaning of Holy Scripture.

MYERS—"There were in the bands of pilgrims men whose hands were stained with the blackest crimes, but who believed that the past could be buried in oblivion by the penance of the pious pilgrimage."

Comment—The repentant criminals believed no such nonsense; and doubtless cared very little whether the past were "buried in oblivion" or not, provided God would pardon their crimes. We wish to remind the professor that his treatment of this subject smacks of levity, and that levity in sacred matters is blasphemy.

Causes of the Crusades.—

MYERS—"The Saracen Caliphs for the four centuries and more that they had possession of Palestine, pursued

usually an enlightened policy towards the pilgrims, even encouraging pilgrimages as a source of revenue."

Comment—We doubt not that the Saracens regarded almost any system of money-getting as defensible and commendable, especially when practiced on the "Christain dogs;" but till now we had never seen it advocated as an "enlightened policy," by a professor and author.

The Preaching of Peter the Hermit.—

MYERS—"The ardor of the zealot is represented as flaming up in the soul of the hermit, as he vows to arouse the warriors of the West to avenge the wrongs of their brethren in the East."

Comment—A "zealot" is an overzealous and fanatical person, which Peter the Hermit certainly was not. Is it an impious tendency that directs our author in the choice of words? "Zealot" is used in a bad sense. Peter the Hermit was a man of tenderest Christian sympathies, of noblest Christian zeal; and to these admirable qualities he added ability and eloquence that place him among the world's greatest heroes.

MYERS—"The people look upon the monk, clothed in the coarse raiment of an anchorite, as a messenger from heaven."

Comment—They did not regard him as a messenger come down from heaven, but as a man sent from God.

MYERS—"They even venerate the ass upon which he rides."

Comment—And why should they not? The horse of George Washington was more esteemed than the horse

of Benedict Arnold; and whereas everybody knows the name of the noble animal that carried Alexander the Great through his marvelous campaigns, very few perhaps know whether Mr. Myers' charger is a horse or a mule. The glory of the rider reflects glory upon the beast that bears him.

MYERS—"The real originator of the First Crusade was Pope Urban, and not the hermit as the legend represents."

Comment—Pope Urban commissioned Peter to preach it, and Peter fulfilled the commission. Thus, they divide the honor.

The Councils of Piacenza and Clermont.—

II. THE FIRST CRUSADE.

Mustering of the Crusaders.—

MYERS—"While the religious feelings of the age had been specially appealed to, all the various sentiments of ambition, chivalry, love of license, had also been skillfully enlisted on the side of the undertaking."

Comment—We ask our author by whom these base passions were enlisted? Would he have his readers believe that they were enlisted by Pope Urban? He dare not charge it. By Peter the Hermit? That were slander. By the Council of Clermont? No. By whom, then? He does not know. He knows, however, that in the vast and motley assembly who went without authorized leaders there were many unworthy crusaders, actuated by unworthy motives. But to create the impression that the authors of the crusades appealed to the passions of license, worldly ambition, and rapine; or that the crusades

were not essentially religious undertakings; or that the vicious crusader was in keeping with his calling; is to deceive the reader and to malign the cause.

MYERS—"By further edict of Pope Urban, everyone assuming the badge of the crusader was by that act, provided it had been prompted by the true spirit of self-sacrifice, absolved from all his sins."

Comment—No, the temporal punishment due to sin. The professor is entangled in the meshes of indulgences, and is as helpless as a fly in a spider's web.

MYERS—"Prodigies of course were not wanting to further heighten the flame of ardor and confirm the resolution of the faithful."

Comment—As the professor on a former occasion made himself merry over miracles, and called faith in "divine interpositions," superstition, we may stigmatize his levity about prodigies as infidel ribaldry.

We praise no one for credulity, or readiness to believe on insufficient evidence, rumors of preternatural or supernatural acts; but a stubborn refusal to accept sufficient testimony is not less unreasonable. Infidelity is as foolish as superstition; and the man who will not admit the sufficiency of the proofs for the miracles wrought at the time of the mustering of the crusaders may be nearer the "Missing Link" than he imagines.

The Vanguard.—

MYERS—"Blinded to the commonest dictates of prudence by his fanatic zeal, Peter the Hermit assumed the leadership of the mixed multitudes."

Comment—We cannot characterize the assumption of leadership "of the mixed multitudes" as prudent, neither

can we commend the spirit of the Vanguard; but we dissent from the author's condemnation of the zealous and righteous leader. Pope Urban had expressly forbidden children to accompany the crusaders, also women unaccompanied by their husbands or brothers, and all ecclesiastics except by permission of their bishops. When it is recalled that the crusaders expected, and reasonably expected, the hearty co-operation of the Eastern emperor, much of the apparent imprudence of the undertaking disappears.

MYERS—"Coming upon some of the mutilated bodies of the followers of Walter (the leader of the first division), Peter ordered a general massacre of the inhabitants of the town at whose gates the bodies were exposed."

Comment—The reader will naturally conclude that the professor is in league with the Turk, and that his warm sympathy is expressing itself. Circumstances, as well as the judgment of most authors, exonerate Peter from all moral turpitude.

MYERS—"The new companies (who joined them at Constantinople), were made up of thieves, adventurers, and fanatics of all sorts."

Comment—There is truth in this statement; however, the folly of some, and the unworthiness of many, condemn not the whole multitude, much less the leader and the cause.

MYERS—"Once in Asia, the crusaders gave full rein to their barbarous appetites and instincts, and pillaged and outraged indiscriminately friend and foe."

Comment—No. It was not so much the crusaders who committed the depredations, as the camp followers,

and those who had associated themselves with the crusaders that they might pillage with greater impunity. By his intemperate and sweeping condemnations, Mr. Myers evinces little of the justice of the judge, or the discrimination of the able historian.

March of the Main Body.—

The Capture of Nice.—

MYERS—"Just at the moment when the crusaders were about to make a final assault upon the city, and were anticipating the license of its sack and pillage, the imperial flag was raised upon its walls."

Comment—It was the universal custom of the Middle Ages for the captors to help themselves to the chattels they found in a captured city. International laws now regulate these matters. There is no reason apparent why the author should publish the anticipations of the crusaders, and little reason to think that he knew them. If pillage were ever lawful, it would seem lawful in this case, for the Turks for centuries had mercilessly robbed the Christians of their property, and pillage now was little else than restitution.

March Across Asia Minor.—

The Capture of Antioch.—

The Pious Fraud.—

MYERS—"The crusaders (besieged in Antioch), were quite soon reduced to the very last extremity of starvation and despair. Ready to die they cursed God for deserting them, when they had given up all for His holy cause:

'if Thou art still an all-powerful God,' they cried, 'what has become of Thy justice?' "

Comment—There is nothing in this prayer that proves it either impious or blasphemous, for it is not to be supposed that the crusaders doubted either God's omnipotence or justice. While we readily admit that instances of blasphemy may have occurred, that they were common, much less universal, is incredible. The crusaders were Christians, many of them exemplary Christians; and true Christians do not curse God in the direst extremity.

MYERS—"A pious fraud was all that delivered the city from the power of the Mussulman host."

Comment—When Mr. Myers has adduced proofs for the falsity of the legend, we will consider his authorities. In the year 1492 the Holy Lance was presented to Pope Innocent VIII., and is now preserved in the Vatican Basilica.

The Ordeal of Barthelemy.—

MYERS—"Having purified the churches of Antioch * * * * and re-established the worship of the Cross in that city * * * * the crusaders * * * * demanded to be led at once to the capture of Jerusalem."

Comment—The crusaders neither established, nor re-established, the worship of the cross in Antioch or elsewhere, if by worship is meant supreme adoration. Worship of the cross is idolatry, a sin against both faith and reason. The professor's acquaintance with the crusaders must be marvelously slight.

MYERS—"Barthelemy, after solemnly declaring that all he had told was true, rushed between the flames. He

passed through, but was so badly burned that he lived only a little while after the ordeal."

Comment—The only way to read the author with satisfaction is to forget each day all that you read yesterday. To-day the crusaders are credulous, superstitious, and cruel; yesterday (see "March of the Main Body"), they were knights of heroic and chivalrous spirit, and worthy champions of the holy cause. As has been said before, ordeals were pagan practices which lingered for some generations after the conversion of the barbarians, but were gradually and effectually eradicated from society by the efforts of the Church.

The Capture of Jerusalem.—

Myers—"The ramparts were swept of their defenders, and the city was in the hands of the crusaders. A terrible slaughter of the infidels now took place."

Comment—The impression left upon the mind after reading this book is that Mr. Myers is about one-fourth Christian and three-fourths Saracen. His deeper sympathies seem all to be with the Moslem. How easy it would be to excuse, or palliate, the infliction of severe and harsh chastisements by men whose co-religionists for centuries had endured all the insults and outrages the cruel infidel could invent. By what right of war could the Turk claim the military amenities which he had never shown?

Founding of the Latin Kingdom of Jerusalem.—

Myers—"Many of the Latin ecclesiastics who had accompanied the army were recompensed for their sufferings and devotion, at the expense of the Greek priests."

Comment—The change in the religion, nationality and language, of the inhabitants of Jerusalem and vicinity, which the establishment of the Latin Kingdom of Jerusalem had effected, required a corresponding change in the pastors of the churches. There was in this change no injustice done the Greek priests, nor reward made the Latin priests. The change was made in compliance with a necessity.

Close of the First Crusade.—

III. The Second Crusade.

Condition of the Latin Kingdom of Jerusalem.—

Myers—"With their zeal inflamed by daily visions and miracles, the Frankish Knights performed prodigies of valor that seem to belong rather to the recitals of romance than to the sober narrations of history."

Comment—The author has declared his disbelief in "divine interpositions," hence his disbelief in "visions and miracles." The above sentence becomes then either an exhibition of servile hypocrisy, or of irreligious sarcasm; both of which are unworthy a Christian gentleman or pagan man. The author is, indeed, under no obligations to the reader to believe that there were visions and miracles in Palestine in the 12th, or even in the 1st, century; but a decent respect for the reader's Christian feelings demanded that they should not be wounded by wanton indulgence in skeptical irony.

Origin of the Three Military and Religious Orders.—

The Fall of Edessa.—

Preaching of St. Bernard.—

Myers—"The contagion of the holy enthusiasm seized

not only barons, knights, and the common people * * * * but kings and emperors were now infected with the sacred frenzy."

Comment—The words "contagion," "infection," "frenzy," "fanaticism," "superstition," "epidemic," etc., etc., that everywhere sully the pages of this chapter, reveal the author's animus, and prove conclusively that for an unbiased and appreciative account of the crusades to issue from his pen were as great a miracle as for the fountain of running water to gush from the "great tooth in the jaw of the ass," for the refreshment of the thirsty Samson. God knows our children are thirsting for the truth, and sick and tired of misstatements and lies. May He open a way for them to it.

MYERS—"The call for aid coming at just this time from the Christians of the East, King Louis VII., resolved to lead an expedition to their relief, hoping thus to wipe the stain of his awful guilt from his soul."

Comment—For about the tenth time has this stupidity been re-hashed and presented to the reader. We almost despair of our ability to make the writer understand that it is not leading an expedition that can "wipe away the stain of guilt from the soul," for leading an expedition is in itself an indifferent act, neither good nor bad; but that the prayers, penances, and sacrifices, of the campaign dispose the soul to receive God's forgiveness.

MYERS—"The expenses of the new crusade were met by the gifts of the pious, by the testaments of the dying, * * * * * by the robbery of the Jews," etc.

Comment—The Jews took advantage of the agitated and disordered state of society to amass wealth quickly,

enormously, and unjustly; therefore did the civil authorities place a heavier burden of contribution upon them. The discrimination seems justifiable.

Treachery of the Greek Emperor.—

IV. The Third Crusade.

Capture of Jerusalem by Saladin.—

Myers—"Coeur de Lion raised money for the enterprise by the persecution and robbery of the Jews; by the imposition of an unusual tax upon all classes; and by the sale of offices, dignities, and the royal lands."

Comment—To the mind of infidels every sacrifice made for Christ, is folly; every imposition of taxes for the prosecution of a Christian cause, is injustice; and every danger and hardship endured, is suicide.

The Siege of Acre.—

Richard and Philip.—

Myers—"The arrogant and perfidious conduct of Richard led to an open quarrel between him and Philip."

Comment—Richard is often condemned for his irascibility, and his haughty bearing; but to call his conduct "perfidious" is to use an epithet that most historians will pronounce inappropriate.

Richard and Saladin.—

Richard's Captivity.—

V. The Fourth Crusade.

The Crusaders Bargain With the Venetians.—

Myers—"The Pope was very much angered that the

crusaders should turn aside from the object of the expedition, and threatened them with all the thunders of the Church, but without effect."

Comment—We deny this statement, and we challenge the author to verify it. The Pope was justly indignant that the crusaders should interrupt the attainment of their sworn purpose; but he did not "threaten them with all the thunders of the Church." The professor had been fishing when he wrote the statement.

Capture of Constantinople by the Latins.—

VI. The Children's Crusade.

Myers—"Stephen of Cloyes brooded over these things (stories of returned crusaders, mournful processions of the Church, symbolizing the captivity of Jerusalem, etc.,) until, like Joan of Arc, he was ready to see visions and hear voices."

Comment—We have already observed that irreverence, and ridicule of sacred and mysterious things, are characteristic of the infidel heart. We recommend to the young reader that he make an act of faith whenever he reads one of the professor's impious jests.

Myers—"While he was in this frame of mind, Stephen was visited by a priest, who represented that he was Jesus Christ."

Comment—From what edition of "Mother Goose" is this fable taken?

Myers—"In great amaze the pilgrims to the shrine of St. Denis crowded about the child preacher, listened with the greatest credulity to the story that he told of the appearance to him of the angel."

Comment—Well, what was it that appeared to the child, a priest, an angel, or Jesus Christ? A renowned professor we think should know that Jesus Christ is not an angel or a mere man. Verily, it is not only "simple-minded barbarians" who are ignorant of "metaphysical subtleties."

MYERS—"It was a dangerous thing in those superstitious times for one to oppose a crusade, no matter what might be its character."

Comment—This sounds enough like the mouthings of Ingersoll to be an excerpt from his lectures. Did the professor ever hear of anyone having been injured in opposing this crusade? Yet it was opposed and stopped. Our author only imagines that it was dangerous, because some story-teller, called "the historian of the movement," says so. We are surprised to find a writer who is at daggers' points with superstition and ignorance, himself so credulous and gullible.

MYERS—"The remarkable spectacle of the children's crusade affords the most striking exhibition possible of the ignorance, superstition, and fanaticism that characterized the period."

Comment—Europe was not thoroughly civilized; the Church had not yet been able entirely to eliminate barbarian superstition; the masses of the people were unlearned, very few persons having any knowledge of letters. But they were strong in faith, and their ardent charity and spirit of self-sacrifice reproach our coldness.

VII. CLOSE OF THE CRUSADES: THEIR RESULTS.

The Minor Crusades.—

End of the Kingdom of Jerusalem.—

MYERS—"The order of 'Templar Knights' was formally abolished by papal bull, issued by Clement V."

Comment—The Templar Knights who had fought so long, so courageously, and so successfully, against the Moslem desecrators of the holy shrines in Palestine, had taken up their abode in Europe. Some serious irregularities were discovered in some of the houses in France, introduced, it was thought, by a superior who had long been held in captivity by the Turks. Pope Clement thought it wise to abolish the order.

Why the Crusades Ceased.—

MYERS—"Even long before the last of the crusades the views of the Western Christians respecting them had materially changed."

Comment—Experience had proved the undertaking impracticable.

MYERS—"They no longer believed in them."

Comment—They no longer believed in their practicability.

MYERS—"It would be utterly impossible to awaken to-day enthusiasm among the European nations for such undertakings."

Comment—Because many of the European governments are anti-Christian, and no European people are united in the faith.

MYERS—"By the opening of the fourteenth century it had become very difficult to get the people to take much interest in the matter."

Comment—Because they had found it impracticable. Prudence called a halt.

MYERS—"The illusion of superstition was broken."

Comment—Because it was unprofitable in hard cash the professor thinks it gross ignorance and superstition.

MYERS—"The people had begun to see the folly, if not the wickedness, of such enterprises."

Comment—The enterprise was not wicked, but holy. Neither was it foolish, for there was good reason to expect success.

MYERS—"This change in feeling was a result of the general advance of the peoples of Europe in knowledge and culture, and the growth among them of a more tolerant spirit."

Comment—The spirit that would calmly tolerate the Moslem occupancy of Palestine, and the desecration of the sacred places, is the same spirit that sold Christ for thirty pieces of silver.

MYERS—"The ambitious and aspiring began to think it wiser to make fortunes through trade, manufacture, and maritime enterprise, than to squander them in costly expeditions for the recovery of holy places."

Comment—That is just what they thought; they weighed a full purse against an empty sepulchre, and they decided that the purse was more valuable. In the same spirit did Judas estimate our Saviour's worth, and appreciate him at thirty silver pieces. The wise men whom the professor admires, the learned, cultured, ambitious, and aspiring, opposed the squandering of fortunes on costly expeditions, just as Judas rebuked Mary Magdalene for squandering precious ointment: "to what purpose is this waste?"

It is wiser to make money than to squander it: so say the worldly wise. But it is wiser to spend it for the

promotion of causes religious and charitable, than to make it, save it, or squander it. This is the reply of a disciple of Christ.

Evils of the Crusades.—

MYERS—"The crusades were attended by all the disorder, license, and crime with which war is always accompanied."

Comment—They may have been attended by all the species of "disorder, license, and crime," but not by the same amount. The nobility of the cause diminished the intensity and amount of incidental evil. The professor sometimes means well, but his philosophical ineptness thwarts his purpose, and casts him into absurdities.

MYERS—"The crusades aroused a persecuting spirit, and 'taught the Church to assault, with military force, whole sects and districts, to slaughter by wholesale, instead of in detail.'"

Comment—The above is not original with the author; he borrowed it: but whether from a lunatic or an imbecile, he does not tell us.

The preposterousness of the assertion that the Church, which was commissioned by our Lord to "teach all nations to observe all things," was instructed by the crusades which she herself originated and directed, is phenomenal.

MYERS—"This is illustrated by the Albigensian wars, in which crusade the Church set herself deliberately to the work of exterminating with fire and sword an entire people—men, women, and children."

Comment—Any fool could make the charge, but ten thousand Myers cannot prove one word of it. We will discuss the matter when it comes up in its proper place.

MYERS—"The crusades also contributed to increase—much to the disadvantage of the people of Europe—the power and wealth of the Church."

Comment—If Mr. Myers were a competent judge we would be willing to hear his opinion as to what was, and what is, disadvantageous to the people of Europe; but unfortunately he is not.

In the solution of any grave question, he counts for very little; and in the decision of a religious question, his opinion is hardly to be considered.

Christ our Lord established his Church for the civilization, Christianization, and salvation of men; and whatever promotes the interests of the Church, certainly promotes the interests of mankind.

MYERS—"By gifts of piety, etc., were augmented the power of the Papacy and the riches of the Church, which led, as we shall see, to much evil,—to tyranny, to strife, to corruption."

Comment—Were not the nobles who bequeathed their estates to the Church or to monasteries and hospitals, at least as qualified as is Mr. Myers to judge the character of those into whose hands the donations were to pass? Is it not presumption, to call it nothing worse, for him, a man without faith or intimate knowledge of the times, to pretend to superior wisdom? It is not to be thought that in any respect is he better fitted than were they to pass a prudent judgment.

Good Results of the Crusades.—

MYERS—"The crusades liberalized the minds of the crusaders."

Comment—We told the reader not to be surprised to find the author changing his mind on almost every page. Under the "Evils of the Crusades" we were told that they aroused a persecuting spirit. Here we are informed that they had just the opposite effect, that they liberalized bigoted minds and moderated the intensity of religious hate. These statements are not compatible.

MYERS—"The voyages, observations, and experiences of the crusaders had just that effect in correcting their false notions, and in liberalizing their narrow and intolerant ideas, that wide travel and close contact with different peoples and races never fail of producing upon even the dullest and most bigoted person."

Comment—If liberal views are the intellectual fruit of travel, and bigotry the oppressive burden of the sedentary; we doubt if the professor has ever seen the other side of College Hill. A narrower book in the department of history it has rarely been our misfortune to read. We have known poor tenants of crowded flats in cramped city lanes, and isolated farmers in sparsely settled districts, who manifested more liberality, more magnanimity, than we find in this book. There is something more essential to the production of broad-mindedness than travel.

MYERS—"The knowledge of geography, and of the science and learning of the East, gained by the crusaders through their expeditions, greatly stimulated the Latin intellect, and helped to awaken in Western Europe that mental activity which resulted finally in the great intellectual outburst known as the Revival of Learning."

Comment—The Revival of Learning was not an unmixed good; but in part commendable and in part condemnable. The revival of the study of ancient literature

and art was, perhaps, beneficial; but the revival of the study of pagan philosophy was baneful.

The author follows in the path beaten by historians of his class, and copies their statements; but he is opposed by a large number of profound historians who think that the eleventh and twelfth centuries were marked by greater mental activity and profounder scholarship than the fifteenth and sixteenth, though learning in the later centuries was more widely diffused.

CHAPTER IV.

Supremacy of the Papacy: Decline of Its Temporal Power.

Introductory.—

Myers—"In the present chapter, we propose to tell how near the Papacy came to realizing its magnificent dream, and of the long struggle between it and the secular rulers of Europe, resulting in the final triumph and emancipation of the temporal power."

Comment—The Church's doctrine that the passions should be subjected to reason, and reason to the divine law, which is what is meant by the subordination of the temporal to the spiritual, the State to the Church, and man to God, is called by our author a "magnificent dream," while its rejection is styled "the emancipation of the temporal power." In accordance with this judgment, political and religious rebellion generally receives his praise. The French Revolution receives hearty, if not unqualified, laudation. The atheistic philosophers of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, responsible in great measure for the wide-spread political calamities that succeeded them, are treated with consideration and seeming approval: why, we know not, except that they were sons of Belial, and refused to bear the yoke of the Lord. With equal reason should the Prodigal Son be praised for his setting out, and condemned for his return. The unfaithful husband merits, too, a meed of commendation, together with the moral reprobate, and the religious heretic. They all assert the supremacy of the temporal over the

spiritual; all emancipate the temporal and natural; all break the law that binds them; all refuse to bear the yoke. They can embrace Mr. Myers with perfect consistency and loving unanimity;—his views are theirs.

Let us see how our divine Lord regarded the relation of the Church to the State. Addressing his Apostles, he said: "All power is given to me in heaven and upon earth: as the Father hath sent Me, I also send you," vested with the same power. "He that heareth you, heareth Me; and he that despiseth you, despiseth Me; and he that despiseth Me, despiseth Him that sent Me." No exception is made in favor of kings or governments; all must receive the law of God from the mouth of the Church. Now, no man who believes the words of Christ, and has any true conception of a church, can hold the doctrine of Mr. Myers.

Pope Gregory VII. (Hilderbrand) and His System.—

Myers—"In carrying out his scheme of exalting the Papal See, * * * Gregory * * * * set about the enforcement of celibacy among the secular clergy, and the suppression of simony."

Comment—The author would have you infer that Pope Gregory urged these reforms for the attainment of selfish ambition. And this foul insinuation is made by a man who registers in the preface of the book his purpose to give "prominence to the virtues, rather than the vices, of men." Why, this cunning hunter ferrets out evil like a Pinkerton detective, and where he cannot find it, invents it. We ask, is it honorable to cast this foul aspersion on the fair name of St. Hilderbrand? Is it honest to insinuate, much less assert, an evil motive, without a ves-

tige of proof, simply because he vigorously discharged an imperative duty? If Mr. Myers cannot understand the Pope's conduct, let him consult with those who can.

MYERS—"To remedy the evil of simony Gregory issued a decree that no priest, abbot, bishop, archbishop, or other officer of the Church should do homage to a temporal lord, but that he should receive the ring and staff, the symbols of investiture, from the hands of the Pope alone."

Comment—Gregory strove to free the Church from the interference and domination of the temporal lords. Nothing could be more praiseworthy.

Excommunications and Interdicts.—

MYERS—"The principal instruments relied upon by Gregory for the carrying out of his scheme were the spiritual thunders of the Church—Excommunication and Interdict."

Comment—This is common bar-room talk. When the author speaks of the Church he seems to forget common politeness.

MYERS—"The person excommunicated was cut off from all relations with his fellowmen."

Comment—The statement is false.

MYERS—"If a king, his subjects were released from their oath of allegiance."

Comment—The coronation oath of the mediaeval kings bound them to fidelity to the Church. To make war upon the Church, or to refuse compliance with her decrees, was a serious violation of the royal oath, and worked the for-

feiture of the crown. The papal excommunication of a king contained a judicial decision that the royal right to the throne had been forfeited by crime.

MYERS—"Anyone providing the accused with food or shelter incurred the wrath of the Church."

Comment—An excommunication is not an accusation, but a condemnation. After a criminal is condemned, it is not customary to speak of him as the accused. We think that Mr. Myers should have known the meaning of these words.

But the author's assertion is false. It was not forbidden to provide the excommunicated with food and shelter, except he had incurred excommunication by name, and not even then if he were in great need.

MYERS—"The interdict was directed against a city, province, or kingdom. Throughout the region under this ban, the churches were closed; no bell could be rung, no marriage celebrated, no burial ceremony performed. The rites of baptism and extreme unction alone could be admistered."

Comment—The imbecile who told Mr. Myers all these dreams, should be interdicted from teaching. In the first place, Baptism and Extreme Unction are not rites, but sacraments. But the author is not more ignorant of ecclesiastical terms than of ecclesiastical laws. The following are the sacraments whose administration is forbidden in an interdicted place: Holy Eucharist, except as Viaticum; Extreme Unction, except to the dying who cannot confess; and Holy Orders. The following may be administered: Baptism, Confirmation, Penance, and Matrimony without the nuptial blessing.

The reader can now perceive what an admirable authority on religious subjects our famous professor is.

MYERS—"It is difficult for those who have come to regard the thunders of the Church as harmless, to realize the effect of these anathemas upon a superstitious age."

Comment—Yes, it is difficult, if not impossible, for those who have come to regard the spiritual as unreal, and the supernatural as mythological—whom the prince of this world has blinded—to realize the spirit and sentiments of the Ages of Faith. Therefore, our advice to them would be to restrain their itching for writing the history of mediaeval times, being well assured of their utter inability to do the subject justice.

Gregory VII. and Henry IV. of Germany.—

MYERS—"The decree of Gregory respecting the relation of the clergy to the feudal lords created a perfect storm of opposition, not only among the temporal princes and sovereigns of Europe, but also among the clergy themselves."

Comment—Every real reform meets with opposition. Many of those whose temporal interests are antagonized by it, are sure to oppose it; but the more intense the opposition the more urgent is the need of reform. Wickedness intrenched in high places, is not dislodged without a hard and persistent struggle.

MYERS—"The Emperor Henry IV. refused to recognize Gregory's decree and even called a council of the clergy of Germany and deposed him."

Comment—Henry had no right to call a council, which was without authority from the beginning; and the act

of deposition was as invalid as it was ineffectual. On the contrary, the Pope's decree of excommunication was both valid and effectual. This may be all Greek to Mr. Myers, but as he grows older he may understand it better.

MYERS—"Gregory in turn gathered a council at Rome, and deposed and excommunicated the Emperor. This encouraged a revolt on the part of some of Henry's discontented subjects."

Comment—There were many and terrible grievances that made them discontented and rebellious.

MYERS—"Henry was shunned as a man accursed by heaven."

Comment—Those loyal German Catholics understood what a papal excommunication meant.

MYERS—"Henry sought the haughty Pontiff at Canossa."

Comment—No lover of truth will relish this mendacious attack upon the character of a sainted pope who was as humble as he was great.

MYERS—"It was winter, and for three successive days the king, clothed in sackcloth, stood with bare feet in the snow of the court-yard of the palace, waiting for permission to kneel at the feet of the Pontiff and receive forgiveness."

Comment—Liberty rejoiced and again took hope when the proud tyrant was brought down. But, alas, Gregory was too lenient, and too quick to forgive the royal hypocrite.

The Popes and the Hohenstaufen Emperors.—

MYERS—"The fierce contention between the Papal See and the Emperors * * * * was simply the continuation

and culmination of the struggle begun long before to decide which should be supreme, the 'world-priest' or the 'world king.'"

Comment—It was a contention to determine whether the temporal ruler was to govern in accordance with the laws of God, proposed by the Church, or in defiance of those laws.

The Papacy at Its Height.—

MYERS—"Under Innocent III. was very nearly made good the Papal claim that all earthly sovereigns were merely vassals of the Roman Pontiff."

Comment—No Pope ever advanced the claim.

MYERS—"Almost all the kings and princes of Europe swore fealty to Innocent III. as their over lord."

Comment—Their subjects often desired them to as a guarantee against royal oppression. All the Catholic kings and princes swore to govern according to justice, and to defend the Holy See; and every Catholic prince of a Catholic state is bound, even without an oath, to do the same.

Pope Innocent III. and Philip Augustus of France.—

MYERS—"Philip Augustus having put away his wife, Innocent commanded him to take her back, and forced him to submission by means of an interdict."

Comment—The Pope is always for justice, and on the side of the oppressed. Here he defends the innocent wife who, rejected by her husband, has no protector but the Church. Contrast this bold espousal of a friendless cause with the fawning compliance of Martin Luther, when

asked by Philip, landgrave of Hesse, for permission to take a second wife: "If Your Highness is determined to marry a second wife, we judge that it ought to be done privately."

Pope Innocent III. and King John of England.—

MYERS—"Innocent's quarrel with King John of England will afford another illustration of the arrogance with which the Pontiff dealt with the sovereigns of Europe."

Comment—We are strongly of the opinion that it will afford another exhibition of the author's galvanized obtuseness.

MYERS—"The See of Canterbury falling vacant, John ordered the monks—"

Comment—And his kingly order meant compulsion—

MYERS—"John ordered the monks who had the right of election to give the place to a favorite of his. * * * * * They obeyed."

Comment—Having given you specimens of his interpretation of Scripture, his understanding of ecclesiastical terms, etc., Mr. Myers now proceeds to display his knowledge of canon law. He fails completely. The monks had no right to elect an archbishop of Canterbury against the command of the Pope. The election was invalid.

MYERS—"But the Pope immediately declared the election void, and caused the vacancy to be filled with one of his own friends, Stephen Langton."

Comment—Priests and bishops, and formerly the people, in conformity with the law, may nominate the candidate for a vacant bishopric, but it is the office of the Pope to appoint, and invest with power the appointee;

and no man, be he king, bishop, or priest, has any right to interfere.

MYERS—"John * * * * proceeded to confiscate the estates of the See of Canterbury."

Comment—In other words, he turned desperado and highway robber.

MYERS—"Innocent III. now laid all England under an interdict, excommunicated John," etc.

Comment—Good for the Pope! This kind of medicine was required to bring the royal reprobate and tyrant to his senses. Now there was no arrogance in the Pope's conduct, but there must have been infinite conceit in the author's mind when he proposed to prove it arrogant.

The Mendicants, or Begging Friars.—

MYERS—"In the new orders, Dominicans and Franciscans, the monk was to give himself wholly to the work of securing the salvation of others."

Comment—Nobody will ever accuse Mr. Myers of any intimate knowledge of these orders. The law of charity on which both of them are founded, requires that the monk labor primarily for his own sanctification and salvation.

MYERS—"Hitherto, while the individual members of a monastic order must affect extreme poverty, the house or fraternity might possess any amount of communal wealth."

Comment—To "affect extreme poverty" means to make a show of being extremely poor; that is, the monks must pretend to be poor, and if they are rich, they must

play the hypocrite. This is an uncommon tribute to our monks and nuns, and to the constitutions by which their lives are directed. Now, a vow of poverty is personal and renders the person making it incompetent to own property. So to take a vow of poverty, and live in a large, well-furnished convent, is not to affect poverty, but to be poor. A monk in a palace is as poor as a monk in a hut.

MYERS—"From their ranks at last were to rise men who should shake the power of the Papal throne itself."

Comment—Luther shook it, but could not overthrow it; yet he shook so hard that he shook himself to death.

MYERS—"A writer who lived not more than half a century after the death of St. Francis declares that: 'The sight of a begging friar in the distance was more dreaded than that of a robber.'"

Comment—It is not difficult to find slanderers if we only seek diligently for them. The Dominicans and Franciscans live now under the same rule as they did in the Middle Ages. Whatever, during the centuries of their existence has been unedifying in their monasteries, has always been the exception. The monks have ever been remarkable for humility, devotion, and zeal; and they still constitute the choice spirits of the Church, as all will agree who have enjoyed the privilege of their intimate acquaintance. But experience teaches that there is nothing so holy but some one will be found to defame it.

Revolt of the Temporal Princes.—

MYERS—"The new Papal Rome, like the old Pagan Rome, had reached out too far and grasped too much."

Comment—The bat said to the moon: "You shine too bright." What a pompous personage is this jack-a-napes! What a pity he was not present with his profound wisdom to inform the Popes just how far they should reach out, and how much they should, and should not grasp! Verily, the number of fools is infinite.

MYERS—"The pontifical throne being then occupied by weaker prelates * * * * the temporal princes * * * * were encouraged to attempt to regain their lost independence."

Comment—The word "independence" does not express the idea, but the intelligent reader will understand that what the princes attempted to regain was freedom from all restraint, and license to do as they pleased.

MYERS—"France, Germany, and England successively revolted, and denied the right of the Pope to interfere in their political and governmental affairs."

Comment—The incentive to revolt against authority is the fruit, as it is the proof, of the corruption of our nature. It is in all individuals, and is manifest everywhere. Even the child asks itself: "What has the Church to do with my thoughts?" The parent says: "The government of my family is my own business." The Catholic freemason declares: "Our society does no harm, and no authority has any right to intermeddle in our affairs." The king says: "It is my right to rule as I please." This is precisely the "independence" which the governmental powers of Europe sought.

MYERS—"The leaders of this revolt against the secular dominion of the Papacy did not think of challenging the claims of the Popes to recognition as the supreme head of

the Church, and the rightful arbiter in all spiritual matters."

Comment—But the leaders were very much like Mr. Myers, and could not, or would not, understand what the Church's divine commission is. They could not, or would not, understand that the fundamental principles of politics are theological, and that the Church in interpreting and enforcing them, necessarily affected political government: and because they could not, or would not, understand what it was criminal for them to be ignorant of, their profession of faith was at variance with their irreligious practices, and their reigns were spiritual calamities.

MYERS—"The Albigenses in Southern France, the Lollards in England, and the Hussites in Bohemia were extirpated or punished by the sword of the civil power, wielded in obedience to the commands of the Roman See."

Comment—If Mr. Myers knows anything about these immoral heretics, he knows that they needed correction. The Church did not desire their extirpation, but their emendation. If their punishment was excessive, the temporal authorities were responsible. As to the Hussites, the Popes had little to do with them.

Boniface VIII. and Philip the Fair.—

MYERS—"Pope Boniface VIII. was an incredibly arrogant, audacious, and injudicious person."

Comment—Cardinal Wiseman, a better critic, wrote: "The character of Boniface is certainly stern and inflexible; but there is no sign of his having been cruel or revengeful. No writer, however hostile to him, ever insinuated aught against his moral conduct or character."

MYERS—"Philip's reply to Boniface was: 'Philip the Fair to Boniface, little or no greetings. * * * * Know thou, O Supreme Stupidity, that in governmental matters we are subject neither to you nor to any other person.' "

Comment—Mr. Myers dislikes the style of this letter, but seems to admire its spirit: we will consider only the truth of the statement of Philip's absolute independence in governmental matters, supposing his Catholicity. Now, if Philip and Mr. Myers were asked how a king could be subject to the Pope in spiritual things and independent of him in "governmental matters," both would be obliged to hold their mouths tight shut. The relation of the spiritual order to the temporal order does not permit such a condition to exist. The principles that are at the foundation of all just government are theological principles, and must be received by the king and people, rulers and ruled, from the divinely established spiritual authority, the Catholic Church. If Mr. Myers could only understand this, he would write less, perhaps, but better. Boniface wrote the king that the Pope's dominion over him was not as temporal prince, but as spiritual sovereign; yet who will deny that spiritual decrees should govern our secular as well as our spiritual conduct?

Removal of the Papal seat to Avignon.—

MYERS—"While it was established here, all the Popes were French, and of course all their policies were shaped and controlled by the French kings."

Comment—Why "of course?" We admit neither the reason nor the fact. Of course all their policies were not shaped and controlled by the French kings. King

Charles V. did not shape and control the policy of Pope Gregory XI. when the latter restored the Papal court to Rome. Mr. Myers should learn to modify his extravagant assertions.

The Great Schism.—

MYERS—"The spectacle of two rival Popes, each claiming to be the rightful successor of St. Peter and the sole infallible head of the Church, very naturally led men to question the claims and infallibility of both."

Comment—While Catholics might doubt which one was the Pope, no Catholic doubted that he who was Pope, was the Vicar of Jesus Christ, and possessed of supreme and infallible authority to teach and govern the faithful.

MYERS—"It gave the reverence which the world had so generally held for the Holy Roman See a rude shock, and one from which it never recovered."

Comment—There is not one of the two hundred and fifty millions of Catholics now in the world who doubts the infallibility of the Roman Pontiff.

The Church Councils of Pisa and Constance.—

MYERS—"In the person of Pope Martin V. the Catholic world was again united under a single spiritual head. The schism was outwardly healed."

Comment—Schism is not heresy, is not infidelity, which may be hidden sins; but schism is essentially "outward," and therefore when outwardly healed is radically and totally healed.

MYERS—"The dissolute and rapacious character of many of the rival Popes had cast ineffaceable stains upon the robes of the pontifical office."

Comment—We do not defend the anti-popes, nor can we say that all the Popes have been saints; but as a class they have been pre-eminently the ablest, the most heroic, and the best men with whom God in his mercy has blessed the world.

MYERS—"The awe and reverence which had once been felt for the Holy See were forever destroyed."

Comment—On the contrary, it is probable that no Pope since the time of St. Peter has enjoyed the confidence, admiration and reverence of the whole people more than Pope Leo XIII, whose body, at this writing, lies in state in St. Peter's Church, Rome.

MYERS—"The splendid scheme of Hilderbrand * * * had at last, as to one-half its purpose, proved an utter failure."

Comment—All the reforms he contemplated he could not effect, and Christian civilization has suffered for it. He sought to untrammel the Church from worldly restraints upon her vigor and freedom, that she might exert the full measure of her salutary influence upon society; but the opposition of sordid monarchs prevented the perfect realization of this plan.

The Papacy remains a Spiritual Theocracy.—

MYERS—"The Council of Constance * * * decreed that the Pope is subject to an ecumenical council, and that a decision of the Roman See may be appealed from to the judgment of the Church in council."

Comment—This decree having never received the Papal confirmation, is, and always was, null and void.

MYERS—"Thus the Church was for a moment converted into a limited monarchy."

Comment—We have said that the decree of the Council of Constance was null and void, and absolutely without effect; and hence the Church was not converted into a limited monarchy. Indeed, the Church cannot change her divine constitution. She is quite a different institution from a "Tract Society" or "Prayer Meeting."

MYERS—"And perhaps if this form could have actually been impressed upon it, and general councils regularly convened, the Roman Catholic Church might have gradually corrected those abuses that had crept into it, and the great popular revolt of the sixteenth century have been prevented."

Comment—It may be with the very best intentions that Mr. Myers offers his opinion; but we assure him that both his opinion and his counsel will be regarded by Catholics as undesirable, incompetent and valueless.

MYERS—"But Martin V., the Pope elected by the Council of Constance, in unfortunate opposition to the edicts of that assembly, issued a bull declaring 'it unlawful for any one either to appeal from the judgment of the Apostolic See, or to reject its decisions in matters of faith.'"

Comment—Mr. Myers is not the proper judge of the case; and whether the Pope's opposition was fortunate or unfortunate, is not a matter coming under his jurisdiction to determine. Pope Martin V. had exclusive jurisdiction, and his decision is final.

CHAPTER V.

Conquests of the Turanian or Tartar Tribes.

Introductory.—

The Turanians and Aryans Compared.—

Myers—"The Turanians and Aryans both exchanged their primitive faiths for religions borrowed from the Semites. * * * * The Aryans generally accepted the faith of the Hebrew Teacher, while the Turanians chose that of the Arabian Prophet."

Comment—A man who thinks that Christianity is a thing borrowed or loaned, and Christian faith a commodity exchangeable among men, and not a supernatural gift of God, must be an intellectual curiosity. Again, we wish to remind the learned but careless author that Christians regard the comparison of the "Hebrew Teacher" with the "Arabian Prophet" as highly disrespectful to our divine Lord.

The Parthian Empire.—

The Huns and Hungarians.—

The Seljukian Turks.—

The Mongols, or Moguls.—

Myers—"It is estimated that the enormous Mogul Empire was built up at the cost of fifty thousand cities and towns and five millions of lives,—a greater waste, probably, than resulted from all the crusades."

Comment—It is not lawful to compare the devastation of unrighteous war with the pious sacrifices of the crusades. The lives and property spent in the latter were not wasted. A greater than Myers has said: "He that loseth his life for My sake shall find it."

The Ottoman Empire.

Founding of the Empire.—

The Janizaries.—

The Conquests of Bajazet.—

Myers—"Bajazet vowed that he would stable his horse in the Cathedral of St. Peter at Rome."

Comment—Did he fulfil his vow? Not exactly, for God whistled, and an eagle swooped down from the East.

Myers—"Bajazet himself was taken prisoner. The conqueror, Tamerlane, treated his unfortunate rival with ungenerous barbarity, carrying him about with him in an iron cage."

Comment—Sacrilege is a crime that generally receives, as it deserves, a terrible visible chastisement.

The Capture of Constantinople.—

Check to the Ottoman Arms.—

CHAPTER VI.

Growth of the Towns: The Italian City-Republics.

The Teutons and the Roman Towns.—

Revival of the Old Towns and Founding of New Ones.—

Relation of the Cities to the Feudal Lords.—

Rise of the Italian City-Republics.—

The Lombard League.—

Dissensions among the Italian Republics.—

Myers—"The Ghibellines * * * * adhered to the Emperor, and the Guelphs * * * espoused the cause of his enemy, the Pope."

Comment—We do not think that the author is so ignorant of the significance of words as to use without a purpose one synonym instead of another. Now, there are four common English words that express the relation of opposition between men, adversary, opponent, antagonist, and enemy; and of these, enemy is the only one that necessarily implies a state of personal hostility. Was the selection made with malice aforethought, or by unfortunate and inexcusable accident?

Myers—"The Venetians had this maxim: 'Venice first, Christians next, and Italy afterwards.'"

Comment—Many maxims in general use do not express the general, much less the universal, sentiment of

the people. Some Venetians may have set their city above the Church, just as some Americans esteem our Republic more than Christianity, and think that patriotism demands such deordination; but all the Venetians, and all the Americans, are not so stupid.

The Establishment of Tyrannies.—

Venice.—

MYERS—"Her supremacy on the sea was celebrated each year by the unique ceremony of 'Wedding the Adriatic.' * * * * The Pontiffs of Rome had come to think that the sea as well as the land was theirs to dispose of as they pleased."

Comment—No Pontiff claimed ownership of the Adriatic, nor bestowed it upon the Venetians; but Alexander III. commissioned the Doge to protect it as a wife, against the incursions of pirates and free-booters, and to publish his commission by the annual celebration of the Wedding of the Adriatic.

Genoa.—

Pisa.—

Florence.—

The Hanseatic League.—

Influence of the Mediaeval Cities.—

MYERS—"Extended commercial relations with Greek, Saracen, and pagan had precisely the same effect upon the trader that contact with different peoples and civilizations had on the intolerant and ignorant crusader. His

curiosity was aroused, his mind liberalized, his horizon broadened."

Comment—We have several times been told by the author that Islam has blighted every nation adopting it; that it represses the aspirations, "paralyzes the will," and "inspires a blind and bigoted hatred of race and creed." Just how, then, association with the Saracens could liberalize the mind, and broaden the horizon of a Christian, we are at a loss to understand; unless it be that indifference to virtue and truth, which is the common fruit of evil associations, is mistaken for liberality. And, indeed, modern infidelity generally does confound liberality with religious indifference. A man is called liberal, not because he is tolerant of those who maintain views contrary to his faith, but because, wanting faith himself, he is indifferent to the professions of others. Liberality is a species of charity, and is a great virtue; indifference, on the contrary, is a grievous sin against the first commandment, and the mother of much evil in society. Travel gives great experience, and often corrects false notions. It is a factor in education.

CHAPTER VII.

The Revival of Learning.

The Revival Outlined:—

Myers—"What is known distinctively as the 'Revival' ends with the Reformation, the great event of the sixteenth century; but ends * * * * as the morning ends when it merges into the fuller light of the day."

Comment—We are told with all the spread-eagle eloquence of the Fourth of July, that the Reformation was "the great event of the sixteenth century." If we ask the author in what it was great except protests, professions, promises, and commotions, he cannot answer. He merely voices his prejudices, and parrot-like repeats the declamations of others. Did the Protestant Reformation introduce a single truth not taught by the Catholic Church? Not one. Did it bring out into clearer view any truth before but dimly seen? It did not. Did it reform any abuse? No. It simply protested against the True Church, virtually denied revelation by denying its interpreter, divided Europe in faith and charity, and prevented, or postponed great national and international social, political, and religious reforms. It is a common opinion among Catholic statesmen that had the great religious revolt never occurred both Asia and Africa would now be civilized and Christianized, and the inhabitants of the whole world would be united in one faith and one charity.

Scholasticism and the Schoolmen.

The Origin of Scholasticism.—

Myers—"The Schoolmen did not question the truth or soundness of the theology of the Church."

Comment—The Church has no theology; she has Christian doctrine or revelation. Theology is science produced by human reason studying the truths of revelation.

Myers—"They accepted all the writings of the Fathers."

Comment—They did not and could not, for the Fathers sometimes disagree. They accepted the decisions of the Church.

Myers—"The Schoolmen said: 'God has given us our reasoning faculty that we may search out final causes.'"

Comment—Oh no, Mr. Myers, they said no such thing; for they believed in one only final cause, God, for whom all things were made, and to whom all things will return.

Myers—"And so with no instrument save the logic of Aristotle, and no knowledge of the laws, forces, or agencies of the universe, physical or spiritual, they fell to work upon the stupendous pile of dogmas and legends of the Church."

Comment—Has Mr. Myers so far forgotten the historian's duty to truth, as to seriously assert that the Schoolmen had "no knowledge of the laws, forces, or agencies of the universe, physical or spiritual?" Pray, tell us, Mr. Myers, what are the spiritual agencies of the universe of which they were ignorant; electricity, at-

traction of gravitation, etc.? But these are not spiritual. If you mean by spiritual forces and agencies, angels; how can you say that the Schoolmen knew nothing of them? You certainly cannot think that their knowledge of spiritual agencies was inferior to your own. The fact is that the Schoolmen had comparatively little to do with the natural sciences, and when they introduced them, it was generally by way of illustration. In purely intellectual science, they far surpass the moderns and, perhaps, even the ancients. He who speaks lightly of their intellectual triumphs, betrays his inability to appreciate them.

The Greatest of the Schoolmen.—

Myers—"The maxim of this typical schoolman, John Scotus Erigena, was, 'I believe in order that I may understand.'"

Comment—This may be very funny to Mr. Myers, and seem very absurd; but we would ask, what is his maxim in reasoning upon revealed doctrines the truth of which cannot be directly perceived by the intellect? Would he first doubt, that afterward he may understand? Does he not know that he who reasons from doubtful premises ends in doubtful conclusions? We fear that the school of Duns Scotus did not comprise all the dunces.

Myers—"About the close of the fifteenth century * * * * the Schoolmen, whose Latin was a barbarous jargon, * * * * fell into contempt."

Comment—The Schoolmen sought not eloquence, but lucidity of expression—they were teachers. In some respects their Latin was superior to our author's English.

MYERS—"The Schoolmen whose real knowledge of Aristotle was very slight, fell into contempt."

Comment—We dare say that Mr. Myers never found any misinterpretation of Aristotle in any of the works of the great Schoolmen. They knew Aristotle from beginning to end.

MYERS—"The low estimate in which the followers of one of the greatest of the Schoolmen was held is preserved in our word 'dunce,' applied to a disciple of Duns Scotus."

Comment—A certain writer has said that when we complain of the ignorance of learned men, it were wiser to find fault with our inability to understand them. Were the professor to study the works of Duns Scotus or St. Thomas of Aquin for a term of years, he doubtless would be as much ashamed of his foolish criticism of the Schoolmen as are we.

Faults of the Schoolmen.—

MYERS—"The Schoolmen busied themselves with the most unprofitable questions in metaphysics and theology."

Comment—It may be so. Let us hear what those questions were.

MYERS—"As, 'How many angels could dance at once on the point of a needle?' "

Comment—That is only a jocular way of asking the serious question: Do angels occupy space? Can the professor answer it?

MYERS—" 'Do angels in moving from place to place pass through intervening space?' "

Comment—Yes, that is the question;—do they? Do angels, creatures without material dimensions, need to pass through intervening space in order to be now at the bottom of College Hill, and now at the top? If the professor will get his mind down to the subject he may soon discover that the difficulty cannot be solved with a sneer.

MYERS—" 'Do angels have stomachs?' "

Comment—That is, do angels require nutriment? and if so, of what kind? and what organs are required for its assimilation? Angels are creatures, therefore dependent, therefore living by participation. What, then, is their food, and how do they use it? The question is not so foolish after all.

MYERS—" 'If an ass were placed exactly midway between two stacks of hay, would he ever move?' "

Comment—That is, does an animal act without a motive? And if two objects were to present exactly equal motives, would one object be preferred to the other? And if not, would the animal ever act? For example, if a soft feather-bed and a cup of hot coffee were the only two and exactly equal attractions at sun-rise, would Mr. Myers get up, or stay in bed? Would he ever get up? Could he get up?

MYERS—"The dispute between Nominalists and Realists—too metaphysical a question for explanation in this place——"

Comment—Yes, or in any other place—for you.

MYERS—"The dispute between Nominalists and Realists * * * distracted the schools and the Church for centuries."

Comment—It engaged, and entertained, and may sometimes have annoyed, the Schoolmen and churchmen; but it did not distract the Church. The Church decides these questions with wondrous facility. The dispute was not unprofitable.

MYERS—"The greatest mistake of the Schoolmen was in their assuming everything taught by theology to be true."

Comment—That cannot be, for they themselves were theologians, and their teaching was theology. Had they assumed "everything taught by theology to be true," there could have been no disputes among them. But they did not believe all theology to be true; they believed revelation to be true, and they believed that the Church was the custodian and interpreter of revelation: and, therefore, when the Church gave a decision, their disputes on that point stopped. We fear that this explanation is lost upon the professor, for we are well convinced that no disciple of Duns Scotus ever was on these subjects more befuddled and befogged than he. We assure him that the Schoolmen will be studied long after his silly criticism of them shall have been repudiated and forgotten.

Good Effects of the System.—

MYERS—"The entire scholastic movement * * * * 'was the first step in the revival of learning,' and not only so, but it was the first step in the more distant movement of the Reformation."

Comment—It seems that our author cannot forget the "dunce" who impressed him so deeply. He seems to think that he was the precursor of the Reformation. It may be so. But between the rigidly logical and con-

sistent theology of the Schoolmen and the fragmentary, halting, and self-contradictory, theology of the Reformers, there is only contrast, not comparison.

MYERS—"There were dangers lurking in so much thinking."

Comment—What a Solomon our author is! "There were dangers lurking in so much thinking!" Wonderful statement! Surely he did not incur that danger when he wrote his criticism of the Schoolmen. But why does he not tell us how much thinking is too much?

MYERS—"Peter Abelard was accustomed to tell his scholars, 'We should not believe unless we first understand.'"

Comment—By which Peter Abelard taught that philosophy is a science whose conclusions are to be accepted, not on the authority of the teacher, but on the authority of his argument. When John Scotus Erigena said, as quoted above, that "I believe in order that I may understand;" he was speaking of the truths revealed by God. The distinction is very clear, and very just. Both the Schoolmen were right.

The Universities.—

Influence of the Saracens.—

MYERS—"The Saracens * * * * during the Dark Ages, were almost the sole repositories of the scientific knowledge of the world * * * * The Arabian scholars were original investigators."

Comment—To us this statement seems to be in direct conflict with the author's quotation from Osborn, in "The Defects of Islam," which states that the scientific knowl-

edge of the Saracens was not original with them, but borrowed from the Eastern Christians. It is also in seeming conflict with the author's own statement under the same caption, that Islam "bars every avenue of social or individual progress and improvement." Now, "original investigation," and progress in "scientific knowledge" are individual; and as there was no "individual progress and improvement," there was no "original investigation," no improvement in "scientific knowledge." It could not reasonably have been expected that such a stagnant race would or could retain the knowledge which they borrowed, nor did they.

MYERS—"Roger Bacon frightened all his contemporaries by his marvelous knowledge of mechanics, optics, chemistry, and other sciences, and was shut up in a dungeon on the charge of being in league with the devil."

Comment—Great inventors have usually been annoyed by the suspicions and opposition of their acquaintances; but no serious harm, and no religious persecution could long afflict one who was an intimate friend of the reigning Pope, Clement IV., to whom he had dedicated his great scientific work, "Opus Majus."

MYERS—"Whatever is owing to Roger Bacon and Albertus Magnus becomes, it must be borne in mind, in large measure a debt to Arabian scholarship."

Comment—It is as hard for the professor to forget the Saracen as the "dunce." He thinks that the illumination of the earth is due to "the dark clouds that gather about the sun;" and that modern science and learning is the work of those who overthrew and destroyed mediaeval institutions of science and learning. This is a unique

method of reasoning; one with which the Schoolmen were little conversant.

As the Saracens have for centuries shown no scientific genius, it is believed by many great historians and philosophers that they never were profound, much less, original thinkers; and that what scientific knowledge they once possessed they obtained from contact with Eastern Christian civilization, and the Fathers of the deserts that they overran. There is little doubt that the hermits in their solitudes made prodigious advances in scientific research.

Effects of the Crusades.—

Rise of Modern Languages and Literatures.—

The New Stimulus.—

Humanism and the Humanists.

The Italian Renaissance.—

Causes of the Enthusiasm.—

Myers—"Dante, by making Virgil his guide through Hell and Purgatory, and by always speaking of him with loving reverence as his teacher and master, gracefully acknowledges the help and inspiration received from the Augustan poet."

Comment—Virgil, being a pagan, could teach the Christian Dante nothing about Hell and Purgatory. How much soever Dante may have been indebted to Virgil as a poet, he certainly owed him nothing as an instructor in Christian doctrine.

Petrarch and Boccaccio.—

MYERS—"Boccaccio's theory of life was just the opposite of that entertained by the monks."

Comment—So much the worse for Boccaccio's theory.

MYERS—"He believed that this earthly existence should be regarded as a blessing, that it should be made a joyous thing."

Comment—Thus far the monks agreed with him perfectly. But how about the means of making it "a joyous thing?"

MYERS—"He would release man from the cloistered dungeon in which Monasticism had shut him."

Comment—When two fools or knaves get together the folly and knavery of each is intensified. Boccaccio was bad enough, but with his modern exponent he becomes two-fold wickeder. What must men and women of sense, Catholics and Protestants, think of this ebullition of stupidity and calumny? Why, the most inglorious, the most shameful of all victories, is that which is won by misrepresenting your adversary, and then attacking the misrepresentation. Yet this is precisely what the professor does. The cloister is not a dungeon, and Monasticism does not deprive men and women of happiness on earth. There is, perhaps, not a monk in America whose mind is narrower or less free, or whose heart is less joyful, than the mind and heart of the author of Myers' History. Our divine Lord declares that he who renounces the world for his sake "shall receive an hundred fold reward now in this time, and in the world to come everlasting life." Now, the monk renounces the world for Christ's sake. Let the professor draw the conclusion.

Search for Old Manuscripts.—

MYERS—"Symonds says * * * * 'these new Knights of the Holy Ghost * * * * felt holy transport when a brown, begrimed, and crabbed scrap of some Greek or Latin author rewarded their patient search.'"

Comment—"Knight of the Holy Ghost" was a civil, not an ecclesiastical title, and we think it a very inappropriate one for him whose occupation was searching for pagan literature.

Effects of the Fall of the Greek Empire.—

The Enthusiasm Crosses the Alps.—

MYERS—"What was in the South a restoration of classical literature and art * * * * becomes, in the more serious and less sensuous North, a revival of primitive Christianity. * * * * The Renaissance * * * * becomes the Reformation."

Comment—Classical literature was pagan literature, and classical art was pagan art, and whatever of religion was taught by either was pagan, and anti-Christian. The restoration of this pagan, anti-Christian, religion, was the Reformation; so says the professor. But he says more: he says that it was the revival of primitive Christianity. But as there was nothing of primitive Christianity in the classical pagan literature and art, their restoration could not have reproduced it. Therefore the Reformation was not the revival of primitive Christianity.

No Protestant denomination can identify itself with primitive Christianity in either doctrine or discipline. The writings of the Fathers, the decrees of the general councils, the symbols of faith, the furniture of the Church,

and the sacraments, rites and ceremonies, prove beyond all doubt the identity of primitive Christianity with the Catholic Church; and he who cannot see it, has no reason to pride himself on his perspicacity.

MYERS—"The Humanist becomes the Reformer."

Comment—And what did he reform? When Luther took a wife, did he reform marriage? When King Henry VIII. divorced and killed his wives, and confiscated Church property, did he reform the Ten Commandments? And so on through the rest of the Reformers. This is not reformation, but deformation; not the rehabilitation of virtue, but vice; not the "revival of primitive Christianity," but——the reader may name it.

Evil and Good Results of the Classical Revival.—

MYERS—"The age of the Renaissance, with its longings and superstitious fears, is well epitomized in the tradition of Dr. Faustus."

Comment—Why does he call those fears superstitious, having already told us that they were realized: "The humanistic spirit," "in Italy, especially," "was disastrous to both faith and morals?"

MYERS—" 'The secret of enjoyment and the source of strength possessed by the ancients allured them.' "

Comment—What secret of enjoyment? The Epicurean secret of enjoyment: "Let us eat and drink, for tomorrow we die?" And what "source of strength?" The author explains; Dr. Faustus "sold himself to the devil." Corrupt nature longed for the "flesh pots of Egypt," for freedom from Christian restraints; for the power that devils have and confer on their votaries.

David sang in the Psalms: "All the idols of the gentiles are devils." The irreligious Christians before the Reformation, would worship at their shrines, and sell an eternal birthright for temporal favors; and where they succeeded in establishing new religions, they called them "primitive Christianity." So we have to-day Christian Science, Spiritism, and hundreds of religious denominations, all of which are a revival of more or less of pagan doctrines and practices.

MYERS—" 'Faustus is therefore a parable of the impotent yearnings of the spirit in the Middle Ages, * * * * its fettered curiosity amid the cramping limits of impotent knowledge and irrational dogmatisms.' "

Comment—Men sell themselves to the devil in every age; but they who so dispose of their souls, long ago rejected the dogmas of the Church. The sale is not made to free them from the dogmas. "The cramping limits of dogmatisms" is what our Saviour calls "the narrow way that leadeth to life." The broad way with its wide gate He calls "the way that leadeth to perdition." However, many of our modern writers choose to praise it as the way of freedom and enlightenment; and that is no doubt the reason why reformers, revolutionists, and sons of Belial of every kind, are so heartily applauded.

MYERS—"During the Middle Ages, the Latin language had become vulgarized in the hands of the monks and schoolmen, had degenerated into a barbarous jargon."

Comment—The language of the Schoolmen is simple and plain, and an apt medium for the communication of scientific truths; but we do not think it either barbarous or vulgar. We generally find that the loudest declaimers

against its unclassical latinity are they who cannot understand it, simple as it is.

MYERS—"The Greek language had been lost, and Greek philosophy perverted."

Comment—The Greek language had not been lost. Most certainly not lost in the East; nor even in the West, for the works of the Schoolmen abound with Greek quotations. As to Greek philosophy, it had been converted, not perverted, by the Schoolmen. We ask Mr. Myers if it is not true that Greek philosophy had been written by the pagan Greeks to subserve paganism, and to inculcate their idolatrous and polytheistic notions of truth? And did not the Schoolmen remold it in a Christian form, and correct its defects, and remove its errors? Was this perversion? It was conversion, and highly commendable. But when the Renaissance restored the ancient classics, it tended to restore the impure philosophy of the ancients. Was not that deplorable and even condemnable? How can Mr. Myers applaud that tendency unless he prefers gilded error to unadorned truth? Unless he admires polished paganism above unpolished Christianity? It is men of his school who are perpetuating the evil of the Renaissance.

MYERS—" 'Greece stretches out her hand to Italy; Italy consigns the sacred fire to Northern Europe; the people of the North pass on the flame to America, to India, and the Australasian Isles.' "

Comment—What "sacred fire" was that that went the rounds? Literature in itself is not sacred: pagan philosophy was not sacred. Our author is as tangled in his words as in his ideas.

Printing.—

MYERS—"Without printing * * * * the Reformation could hardly have become a fact in history."

Comment—A plain admission that the Reformation was of human origin.

MYERS—"Its instrument, the press, is fitly chosen as the symbol of the new era of intelligence and freedom which it ushered in."

Comment—The press is the disseminator of good and evil, of truth and error. The Police Gazette and our yellow-backed dime and nickel novels depend on the press in the same way as did the Reformation.

CHAPTER VIII.

GROWTH OF THE NATIONS.—FORMATION OF NATIONAL GOVERNMENTS AND LITERATURES.

Introductory.—

I. ENGLAND.

General Statement.—

Magna Charta.—

MYERS—"We have in another place told how John made his peace with the Church by doing homage to the Pope and making England a fief of the See of Rome. This pusillanimous act awakened the greatest indignation among all classes throughout England."

Comment—It was not then regarded as pusillanimous. The state of vassalage was the condition of most of the princes of Christendom. The King of Scotland was the vassal of the King of England; and the King of England was the vassal of the King of France. John's father, King Henry, had been a feudatory of Pope Alexander III. The lion-hearted Richard had held his crown from the German Emperor. And as to the act arousing indignation throughout England; on the contrary, it gave the barons a protector to whom they might appeal from the despotic government of their king.

MYERS—"Magna Charta * * * * must be considered the most important concession that a freedom-loving people ever wrung from a tyrannical sovereign."

Comment—And it should be remembered that Magna Charta was a distinctively Catholic document, wrested

by Catholic noblemen led by Stephen Langton, Catholic Archbishop of Canterbury and papal legate, from the tyrant King John. Magna Charta is merely an extension of moral theology. It became part of the common law of England, and subsequently was made the foundation of our Declaration of Independence, and of constitutional liberty for English-speaking peoples in all parts of the world.

Beginning of the House of Commons.—

Conquest of Wales.—

Wars With Scotland.

Edward's Ambition.—

How Scotland Became a Fief of the English Crown.—

Failure of the Celtic Line of Scottish Kings.—

Edward and the Stone of Scone.—

William Wallace.—

Robert Bruce.—

The Battle of Bannockburn.—

The Hundred Years' War.

Origin of the War.—

The Battle of Crecy.—

The Capture of Calais.—

The Battle of Poitiers.—

Battle of Agincourt.—

Joan of Arc.—

Myers—"The young peasant girl, with imagination all aflame from brooding over her country's wrongs and

ST. ALBERT'S COLLEGE LIBRARY

sufferings, seemed to see visions and hear voices, which bade her undertake the work of delivering France. She was obedient unto the heavenly visions."

Comment—It were far better that subjects of this kind had been altogether omitted by the author, for he is not one of those writers who can treat them properly. He seems to deny miracles, and God's special providence in the world, and in consequence, the sublimest subjects, at his hands, are made to appear vulgar or ridiculous. Moreover, his descriptions abound in contradictions; for example, Joan's imagination was aflame, and in her excitement she thought that she saw visions and heard voices; that is, she was deluded and mentally deranged. "Yet she was obedient unto the heavenly visions." Now, this is an offense against both intelligence and faith. Heavenly visions are not imaginary, but real; and the author's attempt to confound the delusions of insanity with the ecstasies of the saints is not creditable to him. Those who write after this manner must expect to be classed with Mark Twain, Bob Ingersoll, etc.

Effects of the War Upon England.—

THE WARS OF THE ROSES.

Causes of the Quarrel.—

The King-Maker.—

Chief Battles of the War.—

The Effects of the War.—

GROWTH OF THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE.

The Language.—

Effect on English Literature of the Norman Conquest.—

Chaucer.—

MYERS—"Chaucer's greatest and most important work is his Canterbury Tales * * * * * * There is a knight, a nun, a monk, a merchant, a parson, a vender of indulgences, a cook, a ploughman, a country gentleman, several wealthy tradesmen, and various other persons."

Comment—The poet says: "Keen optics he must have, I ween; Who sees what is not to be seen." You will find all the characters enumerated by the author, in the prologue, to the Canterbury Tales, except only one,—the "Vender of Indulgences." The insertion of this character savors of dishonesty.

MYERS—"When Chaucer describes the pardoner as having his wallet 'bret-ful of pardouns come from Rome al hoot,' we can guess how the age is beginning to think about the sale of indulgences."

Comment—There is nothing said by Chaucer about the sale of indulgences; nor is the matter hinted at. The "Pardoner" had received from the Pope more extensive faculties for forgiving sins, and these faculties he had in his "wallet." The Catholic reader will understand this: the Pope reserves to himself the power to absolve from certain uncommon sins; the bishop of the diocese acts in like manner; the priest, therefore, is not qualified to absolve in these several reserved cases, but must refer the penitent to the Pope or bishop. Sometimes, and for certain reasons, the Pope or the bishop delegates his full power to a priest. This extraordinary power, these unusual faculties, the "Pardoner," of whom Chaucer speaks, possessed. Our author certainly has great hardihood to attempt the explanation of a matter of which he is totally ignorant.

Piers Ploughman.—

MYERS—"These poems quiver with sympathy for the hungry, labor-worn peasant * * * * despised by haughty lords and robbed by shameless ecclesiastics."

Comment—Mr. Myers probably knows very well that there were no poor-houses in England prior to the Reformation, and that the content and happiness of the poorer classes, who were assisted by their neighbors and the monasteries, merited for that country the title "Merry England." Now, England is the richest and poorest land on earth; the monasteries, confiscated by the Reformers, no longer providing for the needs of the poor.

Would that Mr. Myers had thought it worth his while to inform us how the "shameless ecclesiastics" succeeded in their robberies. They had neither the army nor constabulary at their command, and man to man they could hardly hope to match in strength the hardy yeomanry, especially as the author so eloquently insists that monasticism is the grave of valor, and prayer enfeebles the strength, and the monks were always at their prayers.

Mr. Myers may reply that he does not mean violent robbery, but only a willingness to receive support from even the poorest peasants. But this explanation will not clear him of insincerity, for it is not the apparent meaning of his words; nor will it excuse him of error, for the Holy Scriptures teach that the poorest should contribute something; and our divine Lord commends the generosity of the poor widow who gave a mite, her entire property, into the treasury of the Temple.

There is a lesson suggested by this attack upon the English ecclesiastics, and it is this: Experience teaches that those ranters against priests for receiving gifts and

support from the poor, are themselves the first to oppress the poor, the most relentless in exacting, and the most niggardly in giving. Their sympathy is of that maudlin kind that prompts to copious tears and stingy alms.

MYERS—"Occasional outbursts of wrath against the favored classes are the mutterings of the storm soon to burst upon the social world in the fury of the Peasant Revolt, and upon the religious world in the upheavals of the Reformation."

Comment—We think that the author now calls things by their right names. So the Reformation was a furious "revolt," a series of "upheavals" and "outbursts of wrath." Yet the Scriptures declare: "The anger of man worketh not the justice of God."

Wycliffe and the Reformation.—

MYERS—"Wycliffe gave the English people the first translation of the entire Bible in their native tongue."

Comment—Numerous authorities, both Catholic and Protestant, prove that Bibles in the vulgar tongue were circulated and read centuries before Wycliffe.

MYERS—"Wycliffe, 'the Morning Star of the Reformation.' "

Comment—It is a terrible charge against the Reformation, to associate it with Wycliffeism. Wycliffeism is so irrational, its principles are so absurd, that it must be classed as a phase of insanity.

MYERS—"In 1415 the Council of Constance, the assembly that condemned to the stake Huss and Jerome,—"

Comment—Huss was convicted of heresy by the General Council of Constance. On his refusal to abjure his heresy he was delivered to the civil authorities with

the prayer that his life be spared, and that he be condemned to perpetual imprisonment; but the Emperor Sigismund who had declared during the trial that, "there never was a more mischievous heretic than Huss," was unwilling to mitigate the usual punishment, especially as Huss had committed serious crimes against the civil government. One of Huss' pet doctrines was that a private citizen is justified in killing a tyrant, and is competent to determine whether a ruler is a tyrant. This doctrine would have justified the assassination of President McKinley by Leon Czolgosz. Jerome was associated with Huss—they were two of a kind.

Caxton and the Printing Press.—

Myers—"Manifestly a new day—one to be filled with intellectual and moral revolutions—was breaking over the land of Alfred and Wycliffe."

Comment—A new day is not always a better day; an intellectual revolution is sometimes a revolt against reason; and a moral revolution is frequently a very immoral one. With characteristic ineptness Mr. Myers associates Alfred and Wycliffe, the great scholar and the charlatan, the true-reformer and the pseudo-reformer, the saint and the fanatic.

II. France.

Beginning of the French Kingdom.—

France Under the Capetians.

General Statement.—

The English Possessions in France.—

The French and the Crusades.—

Persecution of the Albigenses.—

MYERS—"During this age of perverted religious enthusiasm holy wars were directed as well against heretics as infidels."

Comment—A heretic is an incipient infidel. Infidelity is the denial of revelation, and heresy is the denial of the authorized teacher of revelation. Revelation without a divine teacher and interpreter is unintelligible and incredible; and hence the rejection of the teacher is virtually the rejection of the doctrine, no matter what profession of faith the heretic may make. Facts bear out the argument, for heresy to-day is everywhere lapsing into downright infidelity.

The Albigenses held Manichaean doctrines, believing that matter is evil and from the devil. They practiced monstrous carnal excesses, and perpetrated the most fiendish cruelties. Pope Innocent III. declared "their teachings ruinous to the Church and subversive of social order, and themselves more wicked than Saracens." As they refused to be instructed in the faith, and assassinated the papal legate, Peter of Castelnau, whom the Pope sent to them; the Pope ordered that a crusade be preached against them. When later word was brought to Innocent of the cruelties of the crusaders in the war, he was prostrated with grief. No responsibility can be attached to the Pope for the excesses of Simon de Montfort, leader of the crusade.

MYERS—"A single incident will illustrate the savage spirit of the crusaders. Upon the capture of a certain town, named Beziers, a Catholic officer asked one of the accompanying abbots how the soldiers should distinguish the heretics from the true believers. 'Kill them all,' was the reply; 'the Lord will know his own.'"

Comment—Not only do Catholic writers reject the story, but all unprejudiced historians deny it. Cæsarius of Heisterbach invented it, together with a thousand other fables. His inventive genius seems to have made him dear to Mr. Myers. Wonder questions, why?

Myers—"The Albigensian heresy was almost extirpated by the cruelties of the Inquisition, which was now set up in the country."

Comment—The author seems to be opposed to every effort to suppress impiety and sensuality by force. We would ask him what method he would recommend for dealing with a crying evil that is ruinous to true faith, a scandal to decency, and an enemy to the existence of society; especially when its votaries will not be persuaded or convinced? Force, indeed, should be the last resort for the correction of abuses; but when all peaceful means have failed, justice demands that authority forcibly intervene.

We will treat of the Inquisition in its proper place.

Admission of the Third Estate to the Royal Council.—

Myers—"Before the growing power of the Third Estate we shall see the Church, the nobility, and the monarchy all go down."

Comment—Oh, no, it is the Third Estate that will go down. When sailors leap from a good ship into the waves, it is they, not the ship, that goes down.

The Abolition of the Order of Templars.—

Myers—"Gain in wealth and power had been accompanied by a loss in virtue and piety. 'All that was holy in the Order became sin and shame.'"

Comment—Mr. Myers is old and experienced enough to know that this sweeping assertion is not true. We put it among "the most incredible rumors."

MYERS—"The most incredible rumors of the immoral and blasphemous character of the secret rites and ceremonies of the society were spread abroad."

Comment—Now you may expect the perpetration of some injustice. Calumniation always precedes confiscation, and gives a color to it.

MYERS—"All classes sustained Philip in his severe measures against the body."

Comment—Perhaps some persons of all classes sustained Philip, but not all persons of all classes. Mr. Myers calls the royal decree of confiscation robbery, and robbery never meets with universal approval.

FRANCE UNDER THE HOUSE OF VALOIS.

General Statement.—

Effects Upon France of the Hundred Years' War.—

Invasion of Italy by Charles VIII.—

FORMATION OF THE FRENCH LANGUAGE AND THE BEGINNINGS OF FRENCH LITERATURE.

The Language.—

The Troubadours.—

MYERS—" 'The tremendous storm that fell upon Languedoc in the crusade against the Albigenses shook off the flowers of Provencal verse.' "

Comment—It was well that "the flowers of Provencal verse" were shaken off, and that the Troubadours were

silenced, for otherwise the indecent songs might have perpetuated and propagated the impious and sensual heresy.

The Trouveurs.—

Prose Writers.—

III. Spain.

Beginning of Spain.—

Union of Castile and Aragon.—

The Conquest of Granada.—

Growth of the Royal Power.—

The Inquisition.—

Comment—The following brief account of the Spanish Inquisition from the lucid pen of Dr. Brownson, fully explains the character of the institution, and its relation to the Church: "The Inquisition was a mixed court, a politico-ecclesiastical tribunal, and as it was to take cognizance, among other things, of religious matters, the Spanish government could not establish it without the papal permission. But it was solicited and conceded, not as a tribunal against peaceable and inoffensive heretics, who appealed only to Scriptures and reason, but, if there be any truth in history, for the purpose of ferreting out and bringing to light persons who were secretly conspiring against the throne and the altar, plotting in secret to overthrow both Church and State by a violent and bloody revolution,—persons whom our own laws would condemn and punish as criminals; for were persons in our own country to conspire against the government and seek by revolution or bloodshed to destroy

even the Catholic Church, they would be answerable to our courts of justice. That the Inquisition was abused, and made the instrument of dark and cruel passions, especially under the reign of Philip II., I do not deny, but a king as absolute as Philip, who could make war on the Pope, and lay waste the ecclesiastical states, cannot hold the Church responsible for his administration. I do not defend, I condemn the cruelties of the tribunal of the Inquisition, although I believe there has been much falsehood and exaggeration in the case. They were, however, great enough, and more than one pope raised his voice and interposed his authority against them, authorized appeals from its judgments to Rome, and even established a court of appeals in Spain herself, where its judgments, in questions touching religion, could be and were frequently reviewed, and set aside. The blame rests not with the pope, nor with the Church, but with the secular government, and the individual inquisitors, who abused the tribunal, and perverted it from its legitimate purpose. I shall not undertake to defend these any more than I would undertake to defend Judas who betrayed our Lord. Even sincere and well-disposed men may sometimes do things which are in themselves reprehensible."

MYERS—"The inquisitors, with their terrible work, sanctioned and favored by both Papal and royal power, became the instruments of the most incredible tyranny."

Comment—The Eighth Commandment declares: "Thou shalt not bear false witness against thy neighbor." A lie is a despicable act that cannot be excused.

MYERS—"The Inquisition succeeded in suppressing freedom of thought."

Comment—What is "freedom of thought?" It is the freedom to think as you will. Could the Inquisition suppress it? No human institution knows what a man is thinking of, nor has power to prevent his thinking as he will. The statement is as absurd as the fact is impossible; and is a good illustration of the author's extravagance. What is said of freedom of thought is equally applicable to freedom of conscience. God alone has power to compel the conscience, and he will not. Thought and conscience are always and necessarily free.

MYERS—"Yet in all this Queen Isabella sincerely believed that she was rendering God good service."

Comment—No cruelties were committed by the Inquisition in the reign of Queen Isabella.

MYERS—" 'In the love of Christ and His Maid-Mother,' she says, 'I have caused great misery.' "

Comment—And so has every monarch and every officer whose duty obliged him to punish criminals. It is not the infliction of punishment that is blamable, but the unjust infliction of punishment.

MYERS—"The data for an accurate calculation of the number of victims sacrificed by the Inquisition during this reign (Ferdinand and Isabella) are not very satisfactory. From such as exist, however, Llorente has been led to the most frightful results."

Comment—Llorente was a hired fabricator, and a renegade, a free-mason, and a bitter anti-Catholic. When Napoleon Bonaparte ursurped the Spanish throne, and set his brother Joseph on it, Llorente, who was secretary-general of the Inquisition at Madrid, was induced to write a book to arouse the indignation of the Spaniards against

the old institutions and the old government of Spain. This he did to the king's taste by forgery, trickery, and the suppression of facts. He misstated the acts of the Inquisition with unconscionable audacity, and then destroyed the records of which he was the custodian that his lies might never be refuted.

MYERS—"Llorente computes that, during the eighteen years of Torquemada's ministry, there were no less than 10,220 burnt," etc.

Comment—No historian believes it. The Inquisition under Torquemada was so lenient that criminals throughout Spain desired to be tried by it.

Columbus Given His Commission.—

Deaths of Ferdinand and Isabella.—

BEGINNINGS OF THE SPANISH LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE.

The Language.—

The Poem of the Cid.—

IV. GERMANY.

Beginnings of the Kingdom of Germany.—

GERMANY UNDER CAROLINGIANS.

The Hungarians.—

Establishment of the Feudal System.—

GERMANY UNDER THE SAXON EMPERORS.

General Statement.—

Henry as the Founder of Cities.—

Renewal of the Roman Empire by Otto the Great.—

Consequences to Germany of the Revival of the Empire.—

The German Kingdom and the Holy Roman Empire.—

Otto III.—

GERMANY UNDER THE FRANCONIAN EMPERORS.

Burgundy Joined to the Empire.—

Henry Third and Henry Fourth.—

MYERS—"The government of the Emperor Henry III. was one of the strongest and best that Germany ever enjoyed. * * * * The Pope was taught to regard the Emperor as his superior."

Comment—For some time it had been the custom for the Emperor to nominate the candidate to the Papal throne, whom afterwards the cardinals elected. Pope Hilderbrand regarded this as an abuse and forbade it. This prohibition precipitated the long contest between the Papacy and the German Emperors which resulted in the triumph of the Papacy.

GERMANY UNDER THE HOHENSTAUFEN EMPERORS.

Welfs and Waiblings.—

Frederick I., Barbarossa.—

Kingdom of Sicily Joined to the German Crown.—

MYERS—"In 1265 the Pope gave the Kingdom of the Two Sicilies as a fief to Charles I. of Anjou who beheaded the rightful heir, the ill-starred boy Conradin, the last of the Hohenstaufen race."

Comment—We would be pleased to learn by what new feat of legerdermain the author makes Conradin the rightful heir of the Kingdom. Conradin was the son of Frederick II. of Germany whom Pope Innocent IV. excommunicated for the grossest and most stubborn injustices, and whose right to the crown he declared forfeited. The Kingdom of the Two Sicilies had been for almost a century joined to the German crown. On the excommunication of the Emperor Frederick II. the Kingdom of the Two Sicilies reverted to its former condition, a fief of the Roman See, and Pope Urban IV. bestowed it upon Charles I. of Anjou. Was there any injustice in this act? and if so, where? Our author will not maintain that kings cannot forfeit their regal rights by tyranny, for George III. forfeited by oppression his right to rule the American colonies. Now, George III. was an angel in comparison with Frederick II. As Frederick II. had lost his right, his son Conradin succeeded to no right.

It is true that Charles I. beheaded Conradin, but it is false that Conradin was the rightful heir to the throne of the Kingdom of the Two Sicilies. The execution of Conradin was effected against the earnest and energetic appeals of the Pope and Louis IX. of France, for clemency.

Consequences of the Hohenstaufen Policy.—

Cathedral-Building.—

MYERS—"A monkish chronicler * * * * says, 'It was as if the earth, rousing itself and casting away its old robes, clothed itself with the white garment of churches.'"

Comment—The sentiment is very beautiful, and the author of it is worthy of respectful treatment. There is an insinuation of contempt about the term "monkish" that is absent from the term "monastic," and the latter is preferred. It is a matter of courtesy and charity and should not be neglected.

MYERS—"The Church collected vast sums by the sale of indulgences."

Comment—As we have good reason to suppose that a prominent historian is not wanting in ordinary historical knowledge, we find it impossible to exonerate the author from the odium of a lie. He stands convicted, before the eyes of all Catholics, of perfidy to truth, and treason to education, by scandalizing children who confide in his statements, and who, wanting authorities for their refutation, believe them.

The Church grants indulgences on the fulfillment of specified conditions, and one of these conditions sometimes has been, alms-giving. The poor man gave a few pence or a day's work; the merchant contributed a block of marble, and the nobleman a statue or window, while the king gave an altar. Thus were the cathedrals built. All gave according to their means, no one gave excessively, none gave involuntarily, none were coerced into giving, and all shared equally in the spiritual blessing, the indulgence. There is no more taint of sale in this than if the condition had been to relieve the poverty of the poor, or recite the rosary.

The sale of indulgences is simony, a great sin, and severely punished by the Church.

Individuals may have trafficked in indulgences, but the sins of lawless individuals are not the sins of the Church. Did you possess a richly indulgenced crucifix,

and by reason of the indulgence sell it for a great price, you would be guilty of simony; but you would not dream of holding the Church blamable for your own personal sin, committed in violation of her commandment.

Germany During the Interregnum.

The Seven Electors.—

Sale of the Imperial Crown.—

Towns and Free Imperial Cities.—

Germany Under Different Houses.

Character of the Period.—

Myers—"'Rome,' said King Rudolf, 'is like the lion's den in the fable—one may see the footsteps of many who have gone there, but of none who have come back.'"

Comment—Charlemagne's returning footsteps were certainly not invisible; nor his alone. Poor Rudolf was no student of history. If, however, he meant that of those who fought against the Church, none prospered, he was right.

Austria Becomes a Possession of the Hapsburgs.—

The Swiss League and the Dukes of Austria.—

The Golden Bull.—

The Hussites.—

Myers—"The doctrines of the reformer were condemned by the Council, and Huss himself was sentenced

to the flames. The following year Jerome of Prague, another reformer, was likewise burned at the stake by order of the same body."

Comment—Neither Huss nor Jerome of Prague was executed by order of the Council. The Council tried them, and found them guilty of heresy, stubborn and intractable. After reason, persuasion, and exhortation had failed to induce Huss to abjure his heresy, he was degraded (for he was a priest), by order of the Council, and delivered to the secular power. The words of the Council were: "Since Holy Church has nothing more to perform in the case of John Huss, this Holy Synod of Constance decrees that he be delivered to the secular judgment and to the secular power." The Council begged the Emperor to be merciful, and recommended that the penalty be imprisonment instead of death; but Sigismund who saw the devastation wrought in Bohemia by the cruel fanatic, would make no concession, but executed the penalty to the full. John Huss was doubtless one of the ablest, worst, and most dangerous, men who have cursed society by their machinations. Five hundred years have not removed from Bohemia the infection of his doctrines and example.

To call such a turbulent fanatic a reformer would be a pardonable joke in an end-man of a colored minstrel troupe; but we did not look for it from a serious author.

MYERS—"The most infamous part of this affair was the imprisonment and harsh treatment of Huss before his conviction; for this was in direct violation of the safe-conduct which the Emperor Sigismund had given him."

Comment—No Catholic who reads the history of this

affair and knows the circumstances, could wish that Huss had enjoyed greater liberty; and as for the severity he suffered, that he brought upon himself. He violated the conditions of the safe-conduct. Huss was an excommunicated man, an excommunicated priest, for whom no public sacerdotal function was lawful; yet on his journey he preached, celebrated Mass, defied the Pope, and published his anarchial views on government; and this too, in a Catholic country where no other faith or worship was known. Even a prisoner must sometimes be restrained. Now, does Mr. Myers not know these facts, or does he knowingly disregard them? He will have few readers to applaud his conduct in the treatment of the case of John Huss.

Myers—"Then began a cruel, desolating war of fifteen years, the final outcome of which was the almost total extermination of the radical party among the Hussites."

Comment—The man who after reading the full account of the Hussite wars, can exonerate blind Ziska, the leader of the Hussites, and his fanatical followers, and lay the blame for cruelty and devastation to the charge of Sigismund and his Catholic soldiers, is more worthy a place on the floor than the rostrum. Neither is it true that the radical Hussites were almost totally exterminated by Sigismund. After Ziska's death, they split up into factions, and fought one another.

We are grieved to find that Ziska was not the only blind man who had anything to do with these wars. A kindred intellectual obscurity seems to have afflicted even the chronicler.

Germany Under the House of Austria.

The Imperial Crown Becomes Hereditary.—

Maximilian I.—

The Imperial Chamber.—

The Wars of Maximilian.—

The Ten Districts.—

Maximilian's Reign a Transition Age.—

Beginning of German Literature.

The Niebelungen Lied.—

The Minnesingers.—

Myers—"The Minnesingers were the Troubadours of Germany."

Comment—The author has an extravagant appreciation of the Minnesingers, and a very erroneous estimate of the Troubadours. The Troubadours of France and Northern Italy were destitute of every Christian sentiment; and their literature, if we except a composition here and there, was not free from the taint of heresy and immorality. The literature of the Minnesingers of Germany was less censurable, and sometimes quite free from doctrinal and ethical defects, but altogether unworthy of the high encomiums it generally receives.

V. Russia.

Beginnings of Russia.—

Disunion and Civil Wars.—

The Tartar Conquest.—

The Rise of Muscovy.—

Russia Freed From the Mongols.—

VI. Italy.

No National Government.—

Myers—"Italy came to the close of the Middle Ages without a national or regular government. This is to be attributed in large part to that unfortunate rivalry between Pope and Emperor which resulted in dividing Italy into two hostile camps of Guelph and Ghibelline."

Comment—The author should have defined the struggle as an effort on the part of the Emperor to appropriate to himself both temporal and spiritual sovereignty; and an effort on the part of the Pope to preserve his spiritual dominion free from the embarrassments of secular interference.

Rienzi, Tribune of Rome.—

Myers—"He caused himself to be crowned with seven crowns, etc. The natural consequences of the Tribune's extravagant follies were soon reached. The people withdrew from him their support; the Pope, now that it was safe to do so, excommunicated him as a rebel and heretic."

Comment—So the Pope never excommunicates except it is safe to do so! He always consults his personal safety! We wonder what Mr. Myers has been doing during the last fifty years that he should display the simplicity of a child. Why, history abounds with instances

in which the Popes seemed to invite persecution and death by the boldness of their excommunications.

The Renaissance.—

Myers—"With the Renaissance, classical elements were blended with Christian ideals, and art became paganized. At the same time it was liberalized, and in insisting upon beauty as being an end worthy in itself, it antagonized the teachings of ascetic Christianity, and helped to lift men into the freedom of the new age. Thus teaching the world the joyousness of physical existence, the art of the Renaissance was one of the angels that led man out of the dungeon in which monasticism had immured him."

Comment—When Mr. Myers stands before Almighty God for judgment, on the Last Day, Satan's most damning indictment against him may be this very paragraph, in which he praises the paganizing of Christianity; inculcates idolatry by "insisting upon (created) beauty as being an end worthy in itself;" declares antagonism to ascetic Christianity (which is another name for voluntary penance), is the way to freedom; makes physical pleasure a thing to be loved and sought for its own sake; and denounces Christian discipline as slavery.

No strictures of ours need be added to his self-condemnation to confirm his degradation or augment his confusion. He stands before the Christian world a self-convicted Epicurean, of the earth, earthly; whose glory is in his shame. The Renaissance to which his love is wedded, is condemned in his praise; and was truly an angel, but an angel, not of light, but of darkness: and the Reformation, of which he says the Renaissance was

the herald and the spirit, is proven in its origin, a thing of evil.

Savonarola.—

MYERS—"Savonarola was at once Roman censor and Hebrew prophet."

Comment—Savonarola was not a prophet.

MYERS—"Such a preacher of righteousness the world had not seen since the days of Elijah."

Comment—Mr. Myers is no doubt an excellent judge of preachers. In what way Savonarola surpassed Christ and the Apostles we are not informed.

MYERS—"He denounced the Medici as the enslavers and corrupters of Florence."

Comment—We thought that the Medici by their patronage of the Renaissance had a warm place in the heart of the professor. Some of them certainly put in practice his doctrines: They "paganized art;" they insisted "upon beauty as being an end worthy in itself;" they "antagonized the teachings of ascetic Christianity;" they "taught the world the joyousness of physical existence," etc., etc. Which doctrines realized in practice would corrupt not only Florence, but the whole world. But by what right, or with what consistency, can the professor applaud Savonarola or condemn the Medici?

MYERS—"He hurled denunciations against the profligacy of the monks."

Comment—He did not; but he hurled denunciations against such monks as were profligate.

MYERS—"He prophesied the wrath of God * * * * on account of the degeneracy of the Church."

Comment—Not at all. He predicted the wrath of God on account of the degeneracy of some Christians.

MYERS—"The activity of his Florentine enemies, and the machinations of the Pope, the detestable Alexander VI., brought about the reformer's downfall."

Comment—Pope Alexander excommunicated him as he deserved, for he was a dangerous agitator and stubbornly disobedient. Still, the Pope treated him with paternal kindness, and wrote to him that, "In spite of facts we begin to believe that you have not spoken in malice, but rather in simplicity;" and concluded with a promise that if the friar would abstain from preaching, and come to Rome, he would annul the censures pronounced against him. To this letter Savonarola replied, demanding to be judged at Florence. There, in the city of his friends and enemies, he was tried and executed. Had he come to Rome, doubtless his life would have been spared.

MYERS—"The detestable Alexander VI. brought about the reformer's downfall, and he was condemned to death, executed, and his body burned."

Comment—Mr. Myers cannot maintain his position for a minute. On the contrary, the Pope interfered to save the agitator.

Mr. Myers calls Alexander detestable, not because he has discovered any detestable act done by him as Pope, but because he loves to repeat the sayings of others. Many hard things have been told against Alexander VI., but nothing reprehensible can be charged against his official acts or his private character after his elevation to the supreme pontificate. Before his ordination he was a soldier, and his military life had not been free

from serious faults; but his irregularities ceased on his elevation to the papal dignity. However, being a Spaniard, he was opposed by the Italian faction; and having reduced the turbulent Italian nobles to submission, he was bitterly attacked by them in satires and lampoons. These are the evidences Mr. Myers has been taking, and by them he has formed his judgment.

Myers—"Savonarola may be regarded as the last great mediaeval forerunner of the reformers of the sixteenth century."

Comment—He certainly did not resemble them in his profession of faith, for he was a Catholic in life and at death; but he was an agitator, a declaimer, a fanatic, and certainly was very disobedient.

VII. The Northern Countries.

The Union of Calmar.—

Part II.

MODERN HISTORY.

Introduction.

Beginning of the Modern Age.—

Myers—"The intellectual and religious revival was greatly promoted by the art of printing."

Comment—The Protestant Reformation was not a revival, for it revived nothing. The author comes nearer the truth when, in the next chapter, he calls it a revolution. Such it was, a revolution and revolt against the old doctrines and discipline of the Church; not a revival of doctrines and discipline discarded, forgotten, and neglected. The Reformation was essentially destructive, not constructive.

The Two Periods: Their Chief Characteristics.—

Myers—" 'Rebellion and heresy' as Buckle observes, 'are but different forms of the same disregard of tradition, the same bold and independent spirit. Both are of the nature of a protest made by modern ideas against old associations.' "

Comment—And therefore the heresy of the Reformation was not a revival. It protested "against old associations," against the doctrines and sacraments of the old Church, and thereby did not revive, but repudiated them.

What Buckle says has much of truth in it; political rebellion and religious heresy are but different forms of

the same thing. Political rebellion or revolution denies the divine authority of the state to govern; heresy, or religious revolution, denies the divine authority of the Church to teach and govern. They are alike, and "different forms" of the same spirit. They are like the rebellion of the angels, whose motto was, "non serviam;" like the disobedience of the rebellious child who recognizes no divine authority in his parents.

Writers may seek to cloak the heinousness of rebellion with the vesture of liberty, independence, progress, enlightenment, etc., but sooner or later the cloven hoof and the forked tail will accidentally protrude beneath the gilded robes, and reveal the angel of darkness in the garments of light.

"Beware," young readers, "of false prophets who come to you in the clothing of sheep, but inwardly they are ravening wolves." Religious and political reformers who declaim loudly about liberty, progress, and enlightenment, are the greatest deceivers. They are false prophets.

There is, of course, lawful rebellion against tyranny. The tyrant may forfeit his right to govern: then resisting his power is not resisting the authority of God. However, justifiable revolution is not the rule, but the exception, in modern times.

MYERS—"Geographical discoveries, widening and liberalizing men's thoughts, helped on greatly the mental and religious revolution of the times."

Comment—A liberal mind is a broad and Catholic mind; that is, it is a mind that possesses Catholic or universal truth. On the contrary, a Protestant mind is a mind that protests and denies, and is necessarily nar-

row and illiberal. Therefore, whatever tended to liberalize the mind, tended to obstruct "the religious revolution of the times." However, the mind is not, strictly speaking broadened by the sight of vast oceans, or liberalized by the view of many islands. The heavens above us are a thousand, thousand times vaster than the Pacific, yet astronomers are often narrow, prejudiced, men. Mr. Myers is painfully ignorant of the subject he would elucidate.

Discovery of the New World by Columbus.—

Myers—"The sphericity of the earth was a doctrine held by many at this time; but it was contrary to prevalent theological views, and so it was not safe for one to publish too openly one's belief in the notion."

Comment—Did Mr. Myers ever hear of anyone fearing to publish his views on the earth's shape? Did he ever hear of anyone who suffered persecution for his geographical opinions? Not one. The sphericity of the earth had long been taught as a scientific doctrine in the Papal College at Rome. Indeed, St. Thomas Aquinas, in his Summa Theologica, taught the doctrine about the middle of the thirteenth century.

Myers—"It was not safe for one to publish too openly one's belief in the notion."

Comment—On former occasions the professor gave us specimens of his knowledge of "metaphysical subtleties;" now he regales us with an illustration of his understanding of psychological subtleties. Some geographers, he says, had a "belief in the notion" of the sphericity of the earth. Now, we can understand how geographers, like other men, could have beliefs and notions; but how

they could have a "belief in a notion" surpasses our comprehension. If a man has a notion, he must know that he has it; and if he knows that he has it, he does not believe that he has it, and hence has not belief in it. We have a notion that Mr. Myers studied metaphysics, psychology, and history, in the same school.

The Voyage of Vasco da Gama.—

The Voyage Around the Globe by Magellan.—

Myers—"Grants of unclaimed pagan lands were made on the principle at this time maintained by the Popes that the sovereignty of the world, and pre-eminently that part of it occupied by pagans, had been given to them, and that they might bestow it upon whomsoever they would."

Comment—Mr. Myers must think that his readers are a pack of fools. No Pope ever maintained such a principle as the author attributes to them. Pope Alexander simply exercised that right of arbitration which all Christendom readily conceded to him.

Myers—"Sooner or later, of course, disputes between Spain and Portugal were bound to arise respecting the title to land discovered by Spanish navigators sailing westward, and also reached by Portuguese ships sailing to the East."

Comment—Mr. Myers would perhaps have recommended that the matter be not arbitrated, but that Spain and Portugal settle their disputes in battle. Pope Alexander thought otherwise. His decision did not obviate all possible disagreement, nor is that result expected of a court of arbitration. However, the dispute about the Spice Islands led to no evil results.

Results of Magellan's Voyage.—

MYERS—"Magellan's voyage revolutionized whole systems of thought and belief."

Comment—It did not revolutionize religious belief. Religious belief, or faith, has for its object divine revelation, and depends not at all on "the shape of the earth," or "its place in the universe."

MYERS—"Mediaeval theology had either contributed to or shared in the popular misconceptions respecting the relation of the earth to the sun and the stars."

Comment—All which means nothing more than that theologians are men, and not God, and therefore that they did not know the truths brought to light by astronomers and geographers prior to their discovery. What admirable simplicity the author possesses!

MYERS—"The new geographical knowledge * * * * tended to discredit ecclesiastical authority where * * * * it had assumed the character of a censorship over the opinions and beliefs of men in matters purely scientific."

Comment—Catholics know what is the infallible authority in the Church, and therefore should not be surprised to find the other ecclesiastical authorities fallible.

The Conquest of Mexico.

The Conquest of Peru.—

Spanish Colonization in the New World.—

MYERS—"Having thus hurriedly examined one source of Spanish greatness and reputation, it will be one of our aims in a following chapter to give some idea of the way in which this power, and influence, and prestige,

were used by the sovereigns of Spain in the maintenance of ecclesiastical and civil despotism."

Comment—All history proves that selfish monarchs have ever been bent on weakening the influence of the Church, and arrogating to themselves ecclesiastical powers. Our author says that the Spanish monarchs were an exception to this rule, and not only did they leave the Church free in her works of charity and religion, but even strove to enhance the Church's powers abnormally. It is a bold statement, and doubtless a rash one; and we will watch the author's attempt to prove it, with keen interest.

THIRD PERIOD.

The Era of the Protestant Reformation.

CHAPTER I.

THE BEGINNINGS OF THE REFORMATION UNDER LUTHER.

Introductory.—

MYERS—"Nicholas Copernicus had quite fully matured his heliocentric theory of the universe by the year 1507, but fearing the charge of heresy, he did not publish the great work embodying his views until thirty-six years later."

Comment—Copernicus may have matured his theory by the year 1507, but he did not complete the composition of his book before the year 1530. Soon after, he published his theory, and dedicated the work to Pope Paul III. As to the opposition which the new theory encountered, the Edinburgh Review for October, 1883, had this to say: "Beckmann has conclusively shown that in the sixteenth century, no serious theological objections were made to the Copernican system save from the Protestant side. * * * * Luther pronounced it contrary to Holy Writ, and stigmatized its chief advocate as 'a fool who thought to turn the whole art of astronomy upside down,' * * * * and Melancthon went so far as to desire the suppression by the secular power of such mischievous doctrines."

MYERS—"The sixteenth century had but fairly opened when Luther discovered the New World of the Spirit."

Comment—We have always contended that the Reformation was not a progressive, but a retrograde movement—essentially a protest, a denial, a revolt—and the author has admitted as much, and will admit more before he concludes. But now he tells us that its essence was discovery, that Luther made many and significant discoveries, and, wonderful to relate! discovered even "the New World of the Spirit," itself; but what that may be, we are not informed. Mankind for centuries had thought that Christ our Lord, descending from on high, had revealed the truth, and established the true Church to announce it; but Mr. Myers says it was not so, but that "Luther discovered the New World of the Spirit." It seems that the historian turned preacher has now got himself well into the pulpit, and we may expect some queer antics and numerous somersaults before he tumbles to "terra firma."

The Reformation Defined.—

MYERS—"The Reformation in its essential characteristics was a protest against the formalism and abuses, and a revolt against the authority, of the Roman Catholic Church."

Comment—Before the author, or preacher, can define the Reformation as a protest against abuses, he must prove that the Church had no authority to teach and govern; for if Christ commissioned his Church, it goes without proving, that she could not commit abuses. For the present then we will alter the definition thus: The Reformation in its essential characteristics was a protest and a revolt against the Catholic Church. A very good definition, indeed. It was a protest and a revolt

against authority teaching doctrine, sacraments, ceremonies, and all.

MYERS—"It was a renascence of primitive Christianity, and bore the same relation to mediaeval Christianity that the classical revival bore to mediaeval Scholasticism."

Comment—Mediaeval Scholasticism was at least Christian, and the classical revival was certainly pagan; yet the preacher says that the relation of the latter to the former, that is, of paganism to Christianity, was the same relation that the Reformation bore to Catholicity in the Middle Ages; and this is his "primitive Christianity," and the "New World of the Spirit," discovered by Luther. This is somersault No. 1.

MYERS—"It was an insurrection against Papal and priestly authority * * * * and a transfer of their allegiance from the Church to the Bible."

Comment—We do not think that the preacher is quite so simple as his last statement makes him appear. We think that he knows full well that the Reformers did not transfer their allegiance to the Bible. It is their pivotal doctrine that the Bible is to be interpreted by private judgment, each one for himself. Now, the authority of an interpretation never exceeds the authority of the interpreter. Therefore, the Reformers transferred not allegiance from the Church to the Bible, but from the Church to themselves; which means, that they refused allegiance altogether.

This is somersault No. 2.

Extent of Rome's Spiritual Authority at the Opening of the Sixteenth Century.—

MYERS—"There had been some, like the Albigenses

in the south of France, the Wickliffites in England, and the Hussites in Bohemia so hardy as to deny the supreme and infallible authority of the Bishops of Rome in all matters touching religion. All murmurs and dissent had been suppressed by the sword and the fagot."

Comment—The Patarins, Cathares, or Albigenses, abandoned themselves to the grossest sensual indulgences, and practiced such abominations, that the Church in order to save Christian morals, and prevent the dissolution of society, was obliged to proclaim a crusade against them, and to call upon the secular authority to exterminate them. The Wickliffites and Hussites taught doctrines subversive of social order; and the preacher who will condemn the Church's conduct toward them, or undertake their defense, proves thereby that Christian civilization to his mind is a thing of insignificant value. None of these heretics were persecuted for their religious convictions.

Causes of the Reformation.—

MYERS—"The causes which brought about the Reformation were many. Among others may be mentioned a great mental awakening."

Comment—As the great philosophers and theologians since the Reformation have in no instance been Protestants, we may reject the author's first cause.

MYERS—"The Humanists either fell into religious indifference and skepticism, or, restating their creeds, which they found in conflict with the new learning, reached worthier and higher beliefs."

Comment—The preacher thinks that the Reformers "reached worthier and higher beliefs" by "restating their

creeds," that is, by reforming them into harmony with the new pagan learning; that is, they paganized their Christian creeds.

This is somersault No. 3.

MYERS—"We see the same thing going on to-day. The rapid advance of science is creating an apparent conflict between knowledge and belief."

Comment—Is the "apparent conflict" real or illusory? If real, the faith is false, for God is the author of both revelation and science. But if the faith be true, the apparent conflict between it and true science, cannot be real.

MYERS—"The result is either the flinging aside of all creeds, or the modification of them so as to bring faith into harmony with present knowledge."

Comment—This preacher has no conception of Christian faith; for if he believed that the object of faith was the revelation of God, and that he possessed that faith, could he talk so glibly about the rejection or modification of faith as the only alternative? It were impossible. Our nimble so-called Christian professors who stand ever ready to recast their creeds at sight of a new germ theory or nebular hypothesis, are, in all but the veneer, downright infidels.

He who has Christian faith has no business in the recasting laboratories of heresy. Let him but perfect his knowledge, and it will fall of itself into harmony with God's revelation.

MYERS—"The Humanists of Italy threw aside all beliefs, while the Luthers and Colets and Mores and Erasmuses and Melancthons of the more serious North reformed and thus preserved their creeds."

Comment—Indeed! We did not know that. We have read that Luther and Melancthon were religious acrobats, not second even to the present occupant of the pulpit, but we always thought that Colet and Erasmus lived and died Catholics: and as for Thomas More, he was beheaded because he would not "reform" his creed; and was beatified by Pope Leo XIII.

MYERS—"Much that was held in mediaeval belief was unreasonable, and everything unreasonable must give way before awakening reason."

Comment—If Mr. Myers could distinguish between divine faith and human opinion, he would save himself many awkward tumbles.

MYERS—"A second cause of the Reformation was the open and shameless profligacy of the clergy and monastic orders."

Comment—The clergy of the Catholic Church have always been morally superior to the laity, and as a body have never scandalized, but always edified, them. The unworthy priests who have at times disedified the faithful, have given occasion indeed, but no just cause, for heresy or schism. They who were looking for a pretext to rebel against the Church, found it in the worldly conduct of some ecclesiastics. For a like reason, many non-Catholics whose experience has convinced them that the Catholic Church is the Church of Christ, and whose consciences urge them to enter the fold, smother the grace that impels them, by shutting their eyes to the truth and beauty of the Church, and ranting, as does our author, at the real or imaginary faults of individual churchmen.

MYERS—"A second cause of the Reformation was the open and shameless profligacy of the clergy and monas-

tic orders, and the dissolute and rapacious character of many of the Popes themselves."

Comment—Mr. Myers' bigotry renders his unsupported statement against the Popes, in the judgment of Catholics, utterly worthless. We await his proofs.

MYERS—"The Papacy reached its deepest degradation in the pontificate of Alexander VI., who seated himself in the Papal chair through the most shameless bribery."

Comment—He was unanimously elected, unanimously confirmed; which facts seem to disprove the charge of bribery.

MYERS—"His conduct was simply execrable."

Comment—It is no proof of sincerity or ability, to call hard names.

MYERS—"In his efforts to advance the interests of his infamous son Caesar he stopped short of no crime."

Comment—This is not history, but fiction. We invite Mr. Myers to attempt to prove his assertion.

MYERS—"The claims of the Popes to the right to interfere in the internal, governmental affairs of a nation * * * * fostered the jealousy and opposition of the temporal princes."

Comment—Just claims are never the cause, though they may be the occasion, of jealousy and opposition. But why did the Popes interfere? To prevent the tyranny of monarchs; but they claimed no right, nor did they exercise power, to interfere with just government. In all the author's attacks upon the Popes, he has failed to show a single instance in which their influence was not exerted in the interest of justice and liberty.

MYERS—"Printing scattered broadcast over Europe the Bible, and, as men began to read the book for themselves, they began to doubt the Scriptural authority for many of the doctrines and ceremonies of the Church, such as the Veneration of the Virgin, the supplication of saints," etc., etc., etc.

Comment—It is not necessary, nor is it possible, for Mr. Myers to give a complete list of the doctrines they doubted. They doubted everything that the Bible contained. And as the Church is not only the interpreter, but the custodian and identifier, of the Holy Scriptures; in rejecting her, they rejected the only sufficient reason for accepting the Bible at all, and forthwith began to doubt that it was the Word of God; began to doubt its inspiration, canonicity, integrity, etc. Such is, and must ever be, the consequence of rejecting the Church. Every Reformer used the Bible as a fiddle, and played on it what tune he pleased.

MYERS—"Indulgences, as defined by Roman Catholic theology, are remissions to penitents, of punishment due for sin, upon the performance of some work of mercy or piety, or the payment of a sum of money."

Comment—There is a strong suspicion that Mr. Myers himself composed that definition, or at least doctored it. He certainly got it from no work of Catholic theology. Remissions of temporal punishment are not made on "the payment of a sum of money."

Tetzel and the Preaching of Indulgences.—

MYERS—"The form of these indulgences was as follows:—"

Comment—Mr. Myers is a blind man at midnight with this question. He has the form of indulgence and the form of absolution from sins inextricably tangled, and he seems absolutely incapable of distinguishing the one from the other.

MYERS—"The form of these indulgences was as follows: * * * * I * * * * do absolve thee, first from all ecclesiastical censures, * * * * and then from all sins, transgressions, and excesses," etc.

Comment—On the opposite page, Mr. Myers said: "It is, and always has been, the theory (doctrine) of the Roman Catholic Church that the indulgence remits merely temporal penalties." Now he says that this form of indulgence includes absolution from "sins, transgressions, and excesses." Evidently there is a screw loose somewhere. We recommend that the voluble author study more and write less.

MYERS—"I remit to you all punishment which you deserve in purgatory * * * * and I restore you to the holy sacraments of the Church," etc.

Comment—Provided you possess the requisite dispositions, and have complied with the required conditions.

MYERS—"When you die, the gates of punishment shall be shut, and the gates of the paradise of delight shall be opened; and if you shall not die at present, this grace shall remain in full force when you are at the point of death."

Comment—Provided you be in the state of sanctifying grace.

Martin Luther.—

MYERS—"Years of study, reflection, and mental con-

flict within the cloister, had awakened in Luther's mind doubts and questionings as to many of the doctrines of the Church."

Comment—It was not study and reflection that ruined Luther, but pride and passion. Luther was angered by the selection of Tetzel, rather than himself, to preach the indulgences. He sought a pretext to oppose Tetzel, and engaged in public controversy against his methods with wonderful ardor; but enthusiasm and passion bore him onward beyond his calculations, and he had not the humility to acknowledge his extravagances and retrace his steps.

MYERS—"His last lingering doubt respecting the matter of ecclesiastical penances and indulgences appears to have been removed while, during an official visit to Rome in 1510, he was penitentially ascending on his knees the sacred stairs of the Lateran, when he seemed to hear an inner voice declaring, 'The just shall live by faith.'"

Comment—So we are seriously told that Luther's "last lingering doubt" was removed in 1510: no longer can he believe Catholic doctrine. Yet on Oct. 15th, 1518, at the conference at Augsburg he publicly professed his faith in all the doctrines of the Catholic Church; and openly declared that he had never intended to teach anything offensive to Catholic doctrine, to the Holy Scriptures, to the authority of the Fathers, or to the decrees of the Pope.

Again,—he broke with the Church, the author says, because "he seemed to hear an inner voice declaring, 'The just shall live by faith.'" But that is Catholic doctrine, and in no way conflictive with the doctrine of in-

dulgences. The error of Protestantism on this point is that it teaches, as did Luther, that, "The just shall live by faith, alone." It is the appendicitis that kills the living body of truth.

The Ninety-Five Theses.—

MYERS—"The form which Church penances had taken in the hands of Tetzel and his associates, making sins past and prospective an article of merchandise, was so opposed to reason and the teachings of the Scriptures, that Luther determined to make an appeal to the conscience and intelligence of the world."

Comment—Two pages back the author wrote: "It is, and always has been, the theory (doctrine) of the Roman Catholic Church that the indulgence remits merely temporal penalties." Why, then, does he now say that Tetzel and his associates made "sins past and prospective an article of merchandise?" It is very certain that they did no such thing, and no proof has ever been adduced to show that they sold either indulgences or sacramental absolution. And even if they had, their conduct, being in direct violation of ecclesiastical laws, would furnish Luther no argument for rejecting the Church.

The author's accusations seem to us to be not only dishonorable, but dishonest.

MYERS—"He drew up ninety-five theses, or articles, wherein he fearlessly stated his views respecting indulgences."

Comment—These foolish propositions over which so much fuss has been made, disclose neither originality nor profundity. As to the spirit in which they were proposed and defended, Luther's own words declare.

Under date of Trinity Sunday, 1518, he thus wrote to the Pope: "The propositions which I put forth, Most Holy Father, are in the form of theses, and not of doctrines; of enigmas propounded in an enigmatic style." These ninety-five puerile and false theses, Mr. Myers distorts into "truths boldly and eloquently proclaimed." We can understand Luther's excitement and intemperance, for he was a party to a hot discussion; but Mr. Myers' enthusiasm over a number of absurd and wholly indefensible articles which he himself does not believe, seems to indicate some mental abnormality.

Burning of the Papal Bull.—

The Diet of Worms.—

The Peasants' War.—

MYERS—"The clergy instead of exerting themselves to render more tolerable the lot of the poor peasants, only made it harder by the tithes they exacted."

Comment—The clergy living among the people, have always and everywhere been their friends, and have labored for their temporal and spiritual welfare. It was so in Germany, and it is so in America. We would be surprised to learn that there is a priest in Cincinnati who has done less to lighten the burden of the poor than this very eloquent philanthropist, himself.

MYERS—"The Reformers' teachings were held by their enemies to be the whole cause of the ferment—another illustration of how easy it is for partisans to confuse occasion with cause."

Comment—They did not confuse occasion with cause. The peasants themselves blamed Luther for their calam-

ity, for it was the punishment of trying to realize Luther's doctrine of Christian liberty, another name for license. To their minds both prelates and princes were enemies of Gospel truth; and when Thomas Münzer, leader of the Anabaptists, began to destroy altars and tear down churches, proclaiming the natural equality of all men, a community of goods, the abolition of every sort of authority, and the establishment of a new kingdom of God, composed solely of the just; the civil authorities made war upon him, and overthrew him. Luther well knew whose doctrine had caused the war and by whose command the peasants had been slaughtered, and said: "I, Martin Luther, have shed the blood of the rebellious peasants; for I have commanded them to be killed. Their blood is upon my head; but I put it upon the Lord God, by whose command I spoke."

It is almost incredible that our author could have overlooked these testimonies which so completely upset his theory.

The Reformers are called Protestants.—

Death and Character of Luther.—

Myers—"Beyond all controversy, he was the greatest man of the sixteenth century."

Comment—That depends on what constitutes greatness. He was, indeed, "rough, boisterous, stormy, and altogether warlike," but these qualities are often the accompaniment of inferior ability. He did not by rugged strength draw half of Europe with him. He found Europe inflammable, and he applied the match that ignited it. Luther has been greatly overestimated.

As to his character, James Balmes has the following criticism: "Is it possible to carry raving further than

to pretend to have been taught by the devil, to boast of it, and to found new doctrines on so powerful an authority? Yet this was the raving of Luther himself, the founder of Protestantism, who has left us in his works the evidence of his interview with Satan. Whether the apparition was real, or produced by the dreams of a night agitated by fever, it is impossible to carry fanaticism further than to boast of having had such a master. Luther tells us himself that he had many colloquies with the devil; but what above all is worthy of attention is, the visions in which, as he relates in the most serious manner, Satan, by his arguments, compelled him to proscribe private masses."

MYERS—"He gave an impulse to free thought."

Comment—We challenge Mr. Myers to adduce one sentence ever written or spoken by Martin Luther by which he recognized the right of others to dissent from his views. He was the most intolerant of men, as Mr. Myers surely must be well aware.

Causes that Checked the Progress of the Reformation.—

MYERS—"It seemed as if the revolt from Rome was destined to become universal, and the old ecclesiastical empire to be completely broken up."

Comment—Yes, it seemed so to the infidel; but it could not be so, for Christ had founded his Church upon a rock, and had promised that the gates of hell should not prevail against it. The Church has experienced and survived many trying ordeals, and her triumphs and her longevity attest her divine life. No human institution could have sustained the attacks that have been made upon her.

Divisions among the Protestants.—

MYERS—"John Calvin, * * * * forced to flee from France, * * * * found a refuge in Geneva, of which city he became finally a sort of Protestant pope."

Comment—Calvin was convicted of the execrable sin of sodomy, and sentenced to be burned; but at the request of the Catholic bishop of the diocese, the sentence was commuted: he was branded with the "fleur-de-lis," and driven from the country.

MYERS—"The so-called five points of Calvinism are these: Unconditional election," etc.

Comment—Unconditional election means that God has unconditionally predestined some men to be saved, and some to be lost. If you are predestined to hell, all your efforts to escape it will prove futile—you will, and must be, damned. In other words, the doctrine is this: They whom God ordains to everlasting death, he ordains to sin, that they may be damned justly.

MYERS—"The great Protestant communions finally broke up into a large number of denominations, or churches, each holding to some minor point of doctrine, or adhering to some form of worship disregarded by the others, yet all agreeing in the central doctrine of the Reformation, 'Justification by Faith.'"

Comment—"Justification by faith" is not a doctrine of the Reformation; it is Catholic doctrine. The Protestant doctrine is: "Justification by faith, alone." The Reformation added the "alone," thereby asserting the sufficiency of faith and the inutility or innecessity of hope and charity, and setting the doctrine at variance with Christianity and reason.

MYERS—"Now the contentions between these different sects were sharp and bitter. The liberal-minded reformer had occasion to lament," etc.

Comment—There is no such thing as a liberal-minded reformer of Christianity. Liberal-mindedness is not made manifest by marring God's perfect work.

MYERS—"The liberal-minded reformer had occasion to lament the same state of things as that which troubled the Apostle Paul in the early days of Christianity. One said, I am of Luther; another said, I am of Calvin; and another said, I am of Zwingle."

Comment—If our author were equally blind to material things, he could not distinguish between a snow-ball and a cannon-ball.

The Reformers did not lament the same state of things that troubled the Apostles. The Apostles had held and taught the same doctrines; the Reformers, on the contrary, were at daggers' points on the most fundamental questions. Among the early Christians explanation sufficed to remove all differences; but the contentions among the Protestants, intensified and perpetuated by the contentions of their leaders, were irremediable.

The Inquisition.—

MYERS—"This was an ecclesiastical tribunal, the officers of which were appointed directly or indirectly by the Pope."

Comment—The Spanish Inquisition was a tribunal organized by the State, and was not an institution established by the Church. The laws by which the criminals

were tried and punished were Spanish, not ecclesiastical, laws. The judges were in part ecclesiastics, but they acted as secular judges in the State courts, not in the Church courts.

The Pope approved the establishment of the tribunal, but condemned its crimes; just as our government approves the founding of banks, but condemns the dishonesty of bankers. Criminal courts are necessary, and punishments must sometimes be inflicted, though some courts may be unjust and their punishments excessive.

MYERS—"During the latter part of the fifteenth century the Inquisition * * * * was set up in Spain, the principal victims of its activity there being the Jews, who partly because of their affiliation with the infidel Moors, were objects of the intensest popular hatred."

Comment—The Spanish Inquisition was established to curb the insolence and influence, and to discover and frustrate the machinations, of the Jews and Moors who were the implacable enemies of Catholic Spain. Not only turbulent heresy, but polygamy, seduction, smuggling, witchcraft, sorcery, imposture, etc., etc., were punished by it. It was a national tribunal.

MYERS—"The entire machinery and mode of procedure of the inquisitorial courts were most atrocious."

Comment—An intemperate and prejudiced mind is well nigh incapable of correction or instruction, and the author will probably carry his ignorant prejudgments unmodified to the grave.

"The mode of procedure of the inquisitorial courts" was the same as that which obtained in the state criminal courts of Europe, very much mitigated by Torquemada's rules.

MYERS—"Parents were commanded to inform against their children, and children against their parents."

Comment—And so will they be commanded on the Last Day; why should they not now for the preservation of morality and Christianity in a whole nation?

MYERS—"He who knew of heresy anywhere and did not reveal it, imperiled his own temporal and eternal interests."

Comment—As Mr. Myers has entered into the "New World of the Spirit" discovered by Martin Luther, he must certainly know what imperils a man's eternal interests; but as to the danger that threatened his temporal interests for not revealing to the Spanish Inquisitors the hiding place of a heretic,—that depended much on the character of the heretic. It was dangerous to conceal the covert of a heretic who was a traitor, as it is with us; and many of the Spanish infidels in the days of the establishment of the Inquisition were enemies, and secret plotters, against the government. The Jews murdered Christian children, and lent money at exorbitant rates of interest to nobles, and impoverished them. If Mr. Myers imagines that the Spanish Inquisition was established to persecute orderly and peaceable heretics, the verdancy of his mind must be phenomenal in its intensity.

MYERS—"The trial of the accused was the veriest mockery."

Comment—Why?

MYERS—"The name of the person making the charge was withheld from him."

Comment—It was not the universal practice even in the purely secular courts for the accused to be confronted by the witness.

MYERS—"By the torture of the rack * * * * were wrung from the accused confession of crime he had never thought of committing."

Comment—The laws of Europe at that time authorized the use of the rack for extorting confession of crime just as custom in our own day and country authorizes the use of the "sweat-box." The professor may, however, rest assured that had there been no crime but heresy to try, there would have been no torture in Spain. The rack was employed to extort confession of treasonable plots.

MYERS—"Death by burning was the favorite mode of execution, as the temporal flames appropriately emblemized the eternal fire awaiting the heretic."

Comment—There are two mean tricks, commonly practiced by ignoble historians; mud-throwing and sand-throwing. The mud is thrown upon the person whose character is to be traduced: the sand is thrown into the eyes of the reader that his vision may be obstructed. We have before us what strongly resembles a specimen of the latter. Heresy did not create the motive for the establishment of the Inquisition, for prior to the Reformation there was no heresy in Spain. Treason allied itself with heresy and thus brought heresy before the criminal courts. The effort, intentional or not, to make it appear that all punishments were directed at heresy, as heresy, and not as political crime, is the specimen of sand-throwing to which we call your attention.

MYERS—"The property of the condemned was usually

divided among the inquisitors, the Papal See, and the temporal princes."

Comment—We know of but one name that adequately expresses the nature of this misstatement, and it is a forceful and uncomplimentary term of three letters.

In Spain the king nominated the inquisitors who were in equal number lay and clerical officials; and dismissed them at will. From the King, and not from the Pope, they derived their jurisdiction; and into the King's coffers, and not into the Pope's, went all the emoluments accruing from fines and confiscations.

MYERS—"This terrible instrument of the Inquisition was employed by the Roman See with tremendous effect."

Comment—A lying historian is of all liars the most abominable, for he lies everywhere and forever. The Spanish Inquisition was not employed by the Roman See. The Roman Inquisition which was under the Pope's control, never shed a drop of blood.

Mr. Myers should feel that in this article on "The Inquisition" he has shamefully slandered the Church, shamefully betrayed the cause of historical truth, and established for himself a lasting reputation for trickery, treachery, and general unreliability.

The Jesuits.—

MYERS—"The Order of Jesuits, or Society of Jesus, was the next most powerful auxiliary concerned in the re-establishment of the tottering throne of the Papal See."

Comment—The throne of the Papal See never totters, for it is founded upon the eternal rock. If to Mr. Myers it seems to totter, the tottering is all in his eye.

MYERS—"The policy of the order was to control the affairs of the world in the interest of the Roman See by having its members in all social, educational, and governmental positions."

Comment—Mr. Myers is either a very simple child or a very cunning rogue.

MYERS—"As the well disciplined, watchful, and bitter foes of the Protestant reformers, * * * * they did very much to bring about a reaction."

Comment—Were Mr. Myers capable of distinguishing between the Reformers and the Reformation, we would tell him that the Jesuits were foes of the latter and friends of the former.

MYERS—"The principles and methods of the Jesuits were destined ultimately * * * * to inflict disaster upon the cause they represented, and to bring much trouble upon the Jesuits themselves."

Comment—As the author has displayed his ignorance of the principles and methods of the Jesuits, his estimate of the consequences resulting from the employment of those principles and methods, cannot be very valuable.

General Results of the Reformation.—

MYERS—"The parental government which Rome established over the self-willed and barbarous peoples (of the North) was a wholesome and needed restraint. But now * * * * these nations, grown to mature and thoughtful manhood, must be left free to work out each its own destiny, without foreign control or interference."

Comment—The author seems to think that grown men and civilized nations have no need of the Church, no need of spiritual direction and assistance. It must

be then that our Lord established His Church only for babes and barbarians; instituted the Sacraments for infants, and revealed His law for cannibals and mud-be-daubers, alone.

Alas, the professor little knows what truth our Lord inculcated in the words: "Unless you become as little children, you shall not enter into the Kingdom of Heaven." There is no such thing as spiritual maturity upon earth, either personal or national.

MYERS—"The clergy and monks had hitherto (prior to the Reformation) been regarded (by the civil governments under whose jurisdiction they lived)* * * * as subjects of the Pope's ecclesiastical empire."

Comment—The European governments prior to the Reformation were Catholic, and granted the clergy and monks certain civil immunities which, after the apostacy, were revoked.

MYERS—"Where there was a revolt from Rome the allegiance of these persons to the Pope was annulled."

Comment—The allegiance of a person to another can be annulled only by the latter. The allegiance of the clergy and monks to the Pope as their spiritual sovereign was not annulled, and could not be annulled, by the civil government under which they lived. But not only did the apostate governments revoke all clerical privileges, but also persecuted, exiled, or killed the priests.

MYERS—"Even in matters of religious doctrine and practice and public worship, the civil power often claimed the final authority hitherto claimed by the Pope."

Comment—And made a mockery of Christianity, as we see in England where the Parliament changed the

definition of the Holy Eucharist at nearly every session, and compelled the subjects under severe penalties to subscribe it under oath.

MYERS—"The doctrines of the Reformers did, indeed, spread into the Latin or Romance nations, but in all of them they were more or less uprooted by persecution."

Comment—By persecution the author means the active measures adopted by the southern governments to prevent the bloody contests that everywhere marked the introduction of the new ideas.

MYERS—"Thus the entire movement of the Reformation may be viewed as another expression and illustration of that independent, freedom-loving spirit," etc.

Comment—Beautiful words, but they cloak a world of wickedness and folly. On the same principles that the Reformation is justified, all revolt and all disobedience can be justified. That "independent and freedom-loving spirit" is what the Serpent appealed to in the Garden of Eden.

MYERS—"The second most important result of the Reformation was the bringing in by it of the principle of religious toleration."

Comment—The Reformers tolerated those only who accepted their doctrines. From first to last they were the most intolerant of men. Luther's tirades against the Jews were so venomous and merciless, that years after his death the mere allusion to his intolerance made the Lutherans hang their heads in shame.

MYERS—" 'Protestants believed that heretics were still to be burned, but speaking against the Pope was declared no longer to be heresy.' "

Comment—It was never heresy to speak against the Pope.

MYERS—"But the path upon which the Reformers had entered led straight to religious toleration."

Comment—Yes, just as straight as intolerance leads to tolerance, and war to peace. This may be clear to the author; but it is somewhat obscure to the reader.

MYERS—"Notwithstanding the Protestants did not see clearly whither it led."

Comment—Catholics saw clearly whither their path led, and naturally felt indignant toward those who attempted to block it. But to compel men to enter with you a path whose terminus you know not, and to confiscate their property, or kill them, if they will not, can hardly be justified. It is as good an illustration of the methods of the Reformers, as it is a bad illustration of "toleration."

MYERS—"In deciding for themselves that the Bible and not the Church is the ultimate authority in matters of faith, the Reformers * * * * made a bold exercise of the right of private judgment, and established a principle that was bound, through a logical necessity, ultimately to result in the broadest religious liberty."

Comment—The Mormons have established the same principle. Does Mr. Myers think that they attain to the "broadest religious liberty?" They frequently bring up in the penitentiary where we are told religious as well as civil liberty is somewhat contracted.

MYERS—"But the times were not yet ripe for the triumph of so beneficent a principle."

Comment—Nor did the times ripen sufficiently till the French Revolution had wiped away established order.

On the ruin of the French government the principle triumphed—for a while. No man can live in society at large and carry the principle of private judgment in all things into practice.

MYERS—"The mental horizon of men was still too narrow, their conception of the relation of State and Church too faulty, and their ideas as to the eternal danger and criminality of error in religious belief * * * * too immature and perverse."

Comment—But now that Mr. Myers is pushing back the curtains of the night, broadening the mental horizon, correcting faulty conceptions of the relation of State and Church, and maturing the half-ripe ideas as to the eternal danger and criminality of heresy into the mature and mellow principle that a man has the sovereign right to believe something, nothing, or anything, as he pleases, and act it out in practical life;—now that the germinal principle has been logically evolved, it may be established, as soon as God abdicates his right to judge and punish man.

MYERS—A third result of the Reformation was its influence upon liberal government. The movement was favorable to political liberty."

Comment—Why, then, was its establishment everywhere followed by persecution, confiscation, crowded jails, executions, and exile?

MYERS—"The Protestant church is democratic in its constitution and tendencies."

Comment—But the Church founded by Christ is not; therefore the intended compliment is a veritable boomerang.

MYERS—"The Protestant church is democratic in its constitution and tendencies; and ecclesiastical democracy has fostered political democracy."

Comment—Where, when, which, and with what results?

MYERS—" 'It can be said with truth,' affirms Fisher, 'that the Reformation made the free Netherlands; the Reformation made free England, or was an essential agent in this work; the Reformation made the free Republic of America.' "

Comment—It is not a whale the Fisher caught: his hook is fast in a snag. Now the little boys will all laugh at the old angler, for well they know that the Catholic Magna Charta was and is the palladium of English liberties; and that the first American colony to show religious toleration was the Catholic colony of Maryland.

MYERS—"Speaking generally, we may say that Protestantism placed itself on the side of liberty, while Roman Catholicism became the ally of despotism."

Comment—The professor is not a professor of grammar, or he would have known which auxiliary verb to use. He should have written: Speaking generally, we "can" say, for he has the power to say; not, we "may" say, for he "may not" say, has no right to say, what violates the truth.

MYERS—"The nations that accepted Protestantism advanced rapidly * * * * into political freedom; while those that remained under the ecclesiastical yoke of Rome secured for themselves civil and constitutional liberty only after long delay."

Comment—We reply in the language of a prominent Catholic convert: "It is time that our historians and popular writers should reflect a little on what they are saying, when they assert that the Reformation emancipated the mind and prepared the way for civil and religious freedom. This has become a sort of cant, and Catholics hear it repeated so often that some of them almost think that it cannot be without some foundation, and therefore that there must be something uncatholic in civil and religious liberty. It is all a mistake, an illusion, or a delusion. The principles of the Reformation, as far as principles it had, were and are in direct conflict with them, and whatever progress either has made has been not by it, but in spite of it, by means and influences it began its career by repudiating. The man reared in the bosom of the Reformation has no conception of real religious, civil, or mental liberty till he is converted to the Catholic faith, and enters as a freeman into the Catholic Church."

MYERS—"The Reformation was favorable to intellectual progress. * * * The Reformers in order to reach the masses, threw aside the Latin of the Schoolmen, and used the language of the people."

Comment—And thereby brought theology and Christian philosophy into contempt. In consequence Protestantism has not produced a single eminent philosopher or theologian, and will not, and cannot.

MYERS—"The influence of Tyndale's New Testament upon the English language can hardly be overestimated."

Comment—Our works treating of English literature accord Tyndale a very insignificant place. His was an old translation worked over.

MYERS—"Luther's Bible almost created the German out of a class of dialects."

Comment—But rather by reason of Luther's sad pre-eminence than his literary ability.

MYERS—" 'The Reformation in Germany transferred literary activity from the South to the North. Since that time the literary achievements of the Catholic side have been, in comparison with those of Protestants, insignificant.' "

Comment—There is no current literature to-day comparable in elegance and profundity with the Catholic literature of France, Italy, and Spain. After these comes Germany and Scotland. England and Holland bring up the rear, almost out of sight.

MYERS—"Regarding Europe in general, we find that Catholic countries have fettered knowledge by a long index of prohibited books."

Comment—They have fettered obscene, impious, and anarchical, knowledge. It seems that the multiplication and distribution of this kind of books is what Mr. Myers denominates enlightenment and progress. Another authority once assured Eve that knowledge of this sort would open her eyes. The two authorities seem well agreed on their principles and method.

MYERS—"The Reformation had a purifying effect upon morals. It abolished, in the countries which embraced the new creed, the monasteries."

Comment—But not because they were immoral, but because the abolitionists wanted to confiscate the property.

MYERS—"The monasteries * * * * once the nurseries of Christian virtues, had now in many cases become the hot-beds of Epicurean vices."

Comment—By the author's eulogy of the Renaissance because it "antagonized the teachings of ascetic Christianity," "insisted upon beauty as being an end worthy in itself," and approved Epicureanism in substance if not in name, he has forfeited the right to condemn the latter system.

MYERS—"It did away with the celibacy of the clergy which had been the occasion of great immorality."

Comment—That was not the reason. Their preachers had not the grace to practice the virtue.

MYERS—"And then the holy fervor enkindled in many souls, also tended to exalt and purify the life, as witness the Puritans of England, the Huguenots of France, and the Covenanters of Scotland."

Comment—How about the descendants of these in America? The Rev. Brevard D. Sinclair, pastor of the Old South Presbyterian church, Newburyport, Mass., had this to say to his congregation, on sins against the Sixth Commandment, a few years ago:

"It makes no difference to God whether your ancestors came over the sea in the Mayflower or in the steerage of a Cunarder, nor whether your pedigree can be traced to a Puritan or to an assisted emigrant from Cork; but one thing is of paramount concern to God—He intends to fill this world with righteousness, and he will see to it that the people who violate His laws shall perish from the earth, and that those who obey His precepts shall occupy the place of a disobedient people. If the Romanists will obey God * * * * and rehabilitate the

crumbling, decaying, rotten wrecks of the New England home, State and Church, by obliterating this sin, then they will and ought to possess this land."

And we may add that this is just what they are doing. Catholics are rapidly displacing the old Puritan stock of New England.

MYERS—"The Reformation, furthermore, has been favorable to material progress."

Comment—The Reformation having turned away men's minds from spiritual to material things could have been expected to surpass Catholicity in this field of activity. But even here Protestant superiority is not evident. The great inventions, and commercial and industrial enterprises in Protestant countries, have been generally the work of infidels, not Protestants, or if of Protestants, Protestants only in name. An eminent man who is a devoted Protestant is a "rara avis."

MYERS—"The countries that have remained most completely under the yoke of the ecclesiastical dominion of Rome, as Spain and Italy, have been marked by a strange torpidity of national life, and an almost perfect paralysis of individual enterprise."

Comment—And yet the most prosperous period of the national life of both Spain and Italy was when they were most faithful and loyal to the Church. Infidel governments, and anti-Catholic societies, have been the undoing of both.

MYERS—"The Reformation produced what is called a Catholic counter-Reformation; that is a reformation within the Roman Church herself. She underwent a thorough purification."

Comment—The Reformation did effect a purification of the Catholic membership by draining away many proud, vicious, and turbulent spirits.

When Mr. Myers regains his composure of mind after this passionate attack upon the Catholic Church he will be able to appreciate the sentiments of the toper who, after a night of wild revel, awakes to a full sense of his shame and degradation.

CHAPTER II.

The Ascendency of Spain.

I. Reign of the Emperor Charles V.

Charles' Dominions.—

Charles and the Reformation.—

Myers—"Fortunately for the Roman Catholic Church, unfortunately for Protestantism, and, we must yet add, unfortunately for civilization, the young Emperor placed himself at the head of the Catholic party."

Comment—In the enumeration of fortunate and unfortunate things, the author omitted the misfortune of a public school history being composed by a man whose mind is so warped by prejudice and narrowed by bigotry as to render him incapable of treating a Catholic subject without snarling.

Myers—"Charles, not only during his own reign, employed the strength and resources of his empire in uprooting the heresy of the Reformers, but also transmitted to his successor upon the Spanish throne his own intolerant and persecuting policy."

Comment—Of Charles V. Dr. Brownson says: "He was very lukewarm in suppressing the Protestant rebellions in Germany. He made war on Pope Clement VII., and they were his troops who took and sacked Rome, and from whom the Eternal City suffered more than it had in the early times from the Goths and Vandals. Two years before his death, he resigned his imperial

office, and retired to a monastery to prepare for the Last Judgment. There he often reproached himself for having sacrificed to his temporal interests the paramount claims of the Church."

His Two Chief Enemies.—

First War Between Charles and Francis.—

Second War Between Charles and Francis.—

Myers—"The Pope claimed and freely exercised the power of annulling oaths."

Comment—If Mr. Myers means anything by this statement, it is something very different from what the words import. An oath is the calling upon God to witness the truth of what one says. To speak of annulling an oath is nonsense. Does Mr. Myers mean an oath-bound contract? Perhaps so. The Pope neither has, nor claims to have, the power of annulling contracts, whether oath-bound or not; but he sometimes decides whether a contract or promise attested by an oath, has the requisites that make it just and obligatory. Mr. Myers' assertion that the Pope was moved by jealousy to side with the French King, is the mere guess of an ill-informed guesser.

The Diet of Augsburg.—

The Turks.—

Charles' Expedition Against Tunis.—

Third War Between Charles and Francis.—

Charles' Expeditions Against Ghent and Algiers.—

Fourth War Between Charles and Francis.—

Disastrous Effects of the Wars.—

Persecution of the French Protestants by Francis.—

MYERS—"While 'The most Christian King,' and 'His Most Catholic Brother' had been fighting each other, the doctrines of the Reformers had been spreading rapidly in all directions and among all classes."

Comment—This sounds very sarcastic; and certain it is that these sublime titles were entirely unmerited by either Charles or Francis. Francis had shocked the public conscience by making common cause with the Turk, and Charles had waged war upon the Pope, captured and sacked Rome. But if these titles are misapplied, not less unfittingly could the title of Christian historian be applied to our author. We take our proof from the following paragraph.

MYERS—"Francis had already displayed his zeal for the old faith by cruel persecutions of his Protestant subjects."

Comment—Mr. Myers knows that Francis had no Christian zeal; he knows that "cruel persecutions" are not a display of zeal; he knows that the "old faith" never authorized, encouraged, or approved "cruel persecutions;" he knows that veracity which is an essential virtue of the Christian character, has been by him grossly violated; and therefore he must know that "Christian" cannot be one of his distinguishing titles as a historian.

MYERS—"The severest blow (of persecution) fell upon the Vaudois, or Waldenses, the simple, inoffensive, inhabitants of a number of hamlets in Piedmont and Provence."

Comment—The Catholic Church is not responsible for the misdeeds of King Francis, who was actuated in all he did by political rather than religious considerations. But as to the severity exercised toward the Waldenses, it can be said, that after they desisted from violence toward the Church, her priests and people, they were left in peace, and have remained unmolested to this day in the secluded valleys of Piedmont. The Waldenses, like all heretical sects, had split up into many fragments, some of which had become free-booters, and mountain-robbers. Whatever they were at the outset, they degenerated into social pests, and like other outlaws, merited severe chastisement.

Charles' Wars With the Protestant German Princes.—

MYERS—"Swift, successive defeats of his armies soon forced Charles to give up his undertaking to make all his German subjects think alike in matters of religion."

Comment—We wonder whether this man thinks at all; or is he so occupied with writing that he has no time to think? It is a pity that some child did not tell him that communion in one faith does not preclude diversity of religious opinion, nor compel all "to think alike." For example, one Catholic thinks that secular knowledge is preferable to secular ignorance, even if Myers' History must be used to acquire it; another Catholic contends that secular ignorance is better than secular knowledge acquired at some hazard of religious truth. The two disputants believe alike in faith, but think unlike in a matter of religion.

The Religious Peace of Augsburg.—

MYERS—"It was arranged and agreed that every

prince should be allowed to choose between the Catholic religion and the Augsburg Confession * * * * The people, individually had no freedom of choice; every subject must follow his prince, and think and believe as he thought and believed."

Comment—This is not a correct statement of the case. Freedom of worship was granted alike to Catholics and Protestants, and since princes had the right to determine what religion should be practiced in their territory, anyone who was unwilling to comply with the law in his own state, could pass to another.

Abdication and Death of Charles.—

Myers—"While the Diet of Augsburg was arranging the Religious Peace, the Emperor Charles was enacting the part of a second Diocletian."

Comment—It is not always easy to determine when the author is really foolish, and when only playing the fool. Not until a monastery is identified with a country-seat, and penitential discipline is synonymous with husbandry, can it be truly said that Charles "enacted the part of a second Diocletian."

Charles was actuated to seek monastic retirement toward the close of his life, by a priest's remark that deeply impressed him; that a monarch should retire from the cares of the world a few years before his death, to prepare for an eternal kingdom.

Charles' Last Instruction to Philip Respecting the Protestants.—

Myers—"Charles made the following reflection: 'How foolish I have been to think that I could make all men

believe alike about religion, when here I cannot make even two clocks keep the same time.' "

Comment—Belief is not "about religion;" it is about Revelation, that is, it has Revelation for its object.

How remarkable is this fact.—Here is a man teaching, preaching, criticising, condemning, and applauding, Catholicity and Protestantism, and all things appertaining thereunto, who does not understand even the very words he uses. He tells us that Charles had tried to make men believe alike. Now Mr. Myers himself, with all his self-confidence, would hardly attempt the impossible task. Charles was a Catholic, and had been taught by the Church that faith is a supernatural habit, infused by God into the soul, giving ability and facility to it to elicit acts of undoubting belief in the Revealed Truth. Charles was neither foolish nor insane, and therefore did not attempt the humanly impossible. The story is mythical.

MYERS—"Sterling wrote as follows: 'The year 1558 is memorable in the history of Spain. In that year was decided the question whether she was to join the intellectual movement of the North or lag behind in the old path of mediaeval faith.' "

Comment—What is faith? A supernatural gift by which we believe the Revelation which God has made. How many faiths are there? St. Paul answers: "One Lord, one faith, one baptism." Mediaeval faith is then identical with ancient and modern faith; that is, it is the one Christian faith. Now, whether it is better to "lag behind in the old path of this faith," or to run ahead and away after phantoms, with Sterling, Myers, Bob Ingersoll, Mrs. Eddy, and others, we will leave the reader to decide.

MYERS—"'In that year was decided the question whether * * * * she (Spain) was to be guided by the printing press,'"——

Comment—The printing press is no more a guide than a phonograph or a saw-buck, and not so much as a donkey. The press talks as it is made to talk, with absolute indifference to truth and falsehood, morality and immorality, genuine and spurious history. We now understand how so many clownish speeches were introduced into Myers' History. The secret is now disclosed; the author has "been guided by the printing press."

MYERS—"'In that year was decided the question whether * * * * she was to be guided by the printing press, or to hold fast by her manuscript missals.'"

Comment—If Mr. Myers ever learns how many historians, incomparably superior to himself, have used manuscript missals, he may awake from his night-mare, and shake off his bed-fellow, Sterling.

II. SPAIN UNDER PHILIP II.

Philip's Domains and Revenues.—

MYERS—"By his bigoted and tyrannical course in respect of his Moorish, Jewish, and Protestant subjects, he ruined the industries of the most flourishing of the provinces of Spain, and drove the Netherlands into a desperate revolt."

Comment—Philip was both a bigot and a tyrant, and we have no objection to his being so called, nor have we any mission to defend him against just censure; but what we do object to is the author's habit of omitting, excusing, or minimizing the misdeeds of Protestants, Moors

and Jews, and exaggerating the faults of Catholics; and then laying the blame to the charge of the Church.

Philip's War With France.—

Philip's Crusade Against the Moors.—

MYERS—"Philip was by nature bigoted, intolerant, and despotic."

Comment—By constant harping on the bigotry, intolerance, and despotism of Philip, together with frequent mention of his Catholicity, Mr. Myers might easily create in the minds of some readers the impression that the Church fostered, or at least tacitly approved his severity and cruelty. The same impression might be made by the simple statement, without comment, that Philip decreed that the Moorish children should receive Christian names, and attend Christian schools, and all this of course against their will, and the will of their parents. Justice requires that explanation be made. Why, then, does not the author say that Catholics as well as Protestants opposed Philip's persecutions? Why does he not mention the efforts of Cardinal Granvelle, prime-minister of the Netherlands, and other prelates, to restrain the King's excesses? Why does he not exonerate the Church by saying that Philip's motives were personal, and that he sought under pretext of supporting the Catholic faith, the realization of his dream of universal monarchy? Justice to the Church demands explanation. No, not a word.

Why, too, does not the author explain the real danger with which the Moors threatened the Spanish government, and what provocation they gave Philip for severity? Justice to Philip demands explanation.

The author lacks something, and we fear that it is not space, to set matters right; from which we infer that Philip was not the only man bound by the chains of bigotry and intolerance.

Defeat of the Turkish Fleet at Lepanto.—

Conquest of Portugal.—

The Death of Philip: Later Events.—

MYERS—"By the expulsion of the Moors, or Moriscoes, more than half a million of the most intelligent, skillful, and industrious inhabitants of the Peninsula were driven into exile."

Comment—The Moriscoes were Islamites, and if what the author said under the caption, "The Defects of Islam," be true, then the assertion that the Moriscoes of Spain were "the most intelligent, skillful and industrious inhabitants of the peninsula," must be false. There the author told us that "Islam discourages effort and enterprise," "sinks its devotees into the lowest degradation," and "bars every avenue of social or individual progress and improvement."

The decree, by virtue of which the Moriscoes were banished, furnishes interesting and instructive reading. After reciting the efforts that had been made in vain to Christianize them, it thus continues: "Knowing moreover from correct and certain intelligence, that they had sent to treat at Constantinople with the Turks, and at Morocco with the King, Muley Fidon, in order that there might be sent into Spain the greatest number of forces possible to aid and assist them (they themselves promising 150,000 men); and knowing furthermore that treaties

had been attempted by them with heretics and other princes, Spain's enemies;" therefore their expulsion was decreed. This decree can be seen in the governmental archives at Madrid, and bears date of Dec. 9th, 1609.

CHAPTER III.

The Tudors and the English Reformation. Introductory.

The Tudor Period.—

Myers—"The great event of the period was the Reformation."

Comment—Mr. Myers must use the word "great" in the sense of a western farmer who complained of the disasters of the past winter. His barn had been burned to the ground; a fine draught horse had crippled himself on a barbed-wire fence; his wife had died suddenly of grippe; and he himself, doubled up with rheumatism, was barely able to limp around. "Oh," said he, "it was a great winter."

The English Reformation First a Revolt and Then a Reform.—

Myers—"All Papal and priestly authority was cast off, but without any essential change being made in creed or mode of worship."

Comment—When the author has shown us that a church without a head is the same as a church with one; and that a religion without a sacrifice is essentially a religion with one; then we will admit the assertion, and that a thing can be and not be at the same time. Until then we must beg leave to differ.

Myers—"Without any essential change being made in creed."

Comment—The Primacy and Infallibility of the Pope have always been a part of Catholic faith. How could these doctrines have been rejected without an "essential change being made in creed?" How could the Holy Eucharist have been rejected without essential change in both creed and worship?

MYERS—"Without any essential change being made * * * * in mode of worship."

Comment—We ask this stupendous theological authority whether there was no "essential change in the mode of worship" effected by casting off all priestly authority, and regarding the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass as a mere ceremony, and assisting at it accordingly. Surely, the author has given us a remarkable book.

MYERS—"So the movement was first a revolt and then a reform."

Comment—Is that so? The author draws conclusions as easily as a bar-keeper draws corks; but he should remember that conclusions should be drawn from something, and not from nothing, and that hitherto he has not said a word to justify the conclusion that the movement was a reform. It was, however, a revolt, and with the revolt, a transformation or deformation. But we are not surprised to find Mr. Myers applauding the revolt, for rebellion, whether in heaven, paradise, earth, or hell, has its admirers. Every rebel and every outlaw, is in the eyes of many, a hero, no matter whether he defies directly divine, ecclesiastical, civil, or parental, authority: and if we are not much mistaken, Mr. Myers' station is not remote from this motley group. This fact will come more in evidence as we advance.

The Revival of Learning in England.—

MYERS—"Green declares that 'the awakening of a rational Christianity, whether in England or in the Teutonic world at large, begins with the Italian studies of Colet.'"

Comment—Does Mr. Green identify Protestantism with rational Christianity? Why, then, can no theologian be found to successfully defend it? The statement proves that he is rightly called Green. May his name be ever written with a capital to emphasize the verdancy of his judgment.

MYERS—"Erasmus' famous satire entitled the 'Praise of Folly' was directed especially against ecclesiastics."

Comment—Erasmus was unsparing in his castigation of the abuses of his times; but a more saintly character than he would have succeeded better. St. Bernard, St. Charles Borromeo, Pope Gregory VII., and many other great Catholic reformers, were as severe as he, but more winning and more successful.

MYERS—"The relation of Erasmus to the whole reform movement * * * * is well indicated by the charge * * * * that 'Erasmus laid the egg, and Luther hatched it.'"

Comment—This is all moonshine. Erasmus lived and died a Catholic. He wrote at times lightly of serious matters, and spoke, perhaps, imprudently; but he never wrote or spoke heretically. Three years before his death Pope Paul III. secured to him an annual revenue of 5,000 ducats. He could not have been much of a Protestant.

The Lollards.—

Comment—The paragraph on the Lollards is very in-

teresting. The author says that they had a disease, a spiritual leprosy, and were trying to spread the infection. The authorities drove them out into the mountains, and there they wandered about, poor and miserable, catching at every mad illusion. Yet these wretches in body, mind, and soul, Mr. Myers makes the collaborators of the Reformation.

II. The Reign of Henry VII.

The Two Impostors.—

Henry's Avarice and Despotism: Benevolences.—

Maritime Discoveries.—

Foreign Matrimonial Alliances.—

Myers—"A rule of the Church which forbade a man to marry his brother's widow, stood in the way of this arrangement." (Marriage of Henry and Catherine.)

Comment—The relation of affinity which existed between Arthur's widow, Catherine, and Henry, was an ecclesiastical impediment to their marriage. The Church having made the impediment, could dispense from it, as she did, and therefore the marriage that followed was valid and lawful. The qualms of conscience which it was said disturbed Henry's peace in after years, on account of this marriage, was gross hypocrisy, as everybody knows.

III. England Severed From the Papacy by Henry VIII.

Opening of the Reign.—

Cardinal Wolsey.—

Comment—The following account of Cardinal Wolsey

is an excerpt from Dr. Brownson's essay on "The English Schism:" "There may have been worse men than Wolsey, who have worn the purple, but we think the Church could hardly have had a worse representative in England at the time. We reject the infamous charges preferred against him after his disgrace, * * * * and we think not unfavorably of his deportment and sentiments after his fall * * * * Wolsey was a vain, ambitious, worldly-minded, unscrupulous man, precisely one of those men who bring discredit on churchmen, and tend to alienate the affections of serious and simple minds from the Church. He was magnificent, a lover of the arts, and a liberal patron of learning and the learned. He was a skillful and in general a successful diplomatist, an able minister, an a passable lord high chancellor; but he was a crafty politician rather than a great statesman.* * * * As a churchman, he forgot the interests of religion, subordinated the interests of the Church to those of the Kingdom, and used her revenues to aggrandize himself and his prince. He did more to shake the stability of the Church in England than the worst of his contemporaries."

Myers—"The Pope, courting the influence of Wolsey, made him a cardinal, and afterwards Papal legate in England."

Comment—By this assertion the author doubtless would insinuate conduct unbecoming a Pope. He could not openly assail the Pope's conduct, so he resorts to insidious suggestion. A hint is often charged with more venom than an open assault.

Henry's Continental Wars.—

The Battle of Flodden Field.—

Henry as Defender of the Faith.—

MYERS—"Henry maintained the divine authority of the Pope, because the validity of his marriage with Catherine depended upon the validity of the Papal act whereby the Levitical and canon law which forbade a man to marry his brother's widow was annulled, and permission given to Henry to marry the wife of his deceased brother, Arthur; and that act was invalid unless the Pope has divine authority to dispense with a law laid down in the Bible."

Comment—What does Mr. Myers care about the ordinances of the Levitical law concerning marriage? Nothing. Do Protestants observe them? No. Do Catholics? No. Why not? Because they ceased on the introduction of the New Dispensation. Does a papal dispensation annul a law? No, it asserts the law. A dispensation is a relaxation of the law in a particular case, but not an annulment of the law. Has the Pope power to annul "a law laid down in the Bible?" He has not. Has the Pope power to dispense from "a law laid down in the Bible?" He has not. He can dispense only from Church laws. But how can Mr. Myers make these false statements? You had better ask Mr. Myers.

Mr. Myers is a great patron of the "New Learning," and the Protestant Reformation with its motto: "The Bible, the whole Bible, and nothing but the Bible; the Bible without note or comment, as the sole rule of faith." Surely, then, he must know something of the Bible! Alas, his scriptural learning has not outstripped his metaphysical attainments. He says: "The Levitical * * * * law forbade a man to marry his brother's widow." Did it? Only when the deceased brother left a child or children,

as Arthur did not. If the deceased left no children, it became the duty of the brother to marry the widow. It was to this law, commanding the marriage of the surviving brother to the widow, that the Sadducees referred when they said to Christ: "Master, Moses said, if a man die having no son, his brother shall marry his wife, and raise up issue to his brother." The exact words of the commandment to which the Sadducees referred are to be found Deut. ch. xxv, v. 5: "When brethren dwell together, and one of them dieth without children, the wife of the deceased shall not marry to another: but his brother shall take her, and raise up seed for his brother." The very contrary of what Mr. Myers asserts, is true.

Now, what a sorry figure does this pretender to scriptural learning present, floundering hopelessly in the shallows of most commonplace knowledge! And the tremendous conclusion that the marriage was invalid unless the Pope had authority to annul a divine law "laid down in the Bible," comes tumbling down, and buries the little Myers out of sight.

MYERS—"This title, 'Defender of the Faith,' was retained by Henry after the secession of the Church of England from the Papal See, and is borne by his successors at this day, though they are defenders of quite a different faith from that in the defense of which Henry first earned the title."

Comment—Aside from temporal considerations, it is probable that Edward VII. does not care a straw for the maintenance of the Anglican Establishment.

Henry Seeks to Be Divorced From Catherine.—

MYERS—"We have now to relate some circumstances which changed Henry from a zealous supporter of the Papacy into its bitterest enemy."

Comment—Henry VIII. was never a zealous supporter of the Papacy, nor even an exemplary Catholic sovereign.

MYERS—"Of the five children born of his union with Catherine, all had died save a sickly daughter named Mary. In these successive afflictions which left him without a son to succeed him, Henry saw, or feigned to see a certain sign of heaven's displeasure because he had taken to wife the widow of his brother."

Comment—Mr. Myers knows very well that the King's feigning was a miserable subterfuge to escape just condemnation for an abominable crime.

MYERS—"And now a new circumstance arose, if it had not existed sometime previous to this. Henry conceived a violent passion for Anne Boleyn. * * * * This new affection so quickened the King's conscience,—"

Comment—This is the first time we have ever heard it stated that a violent passion of carnal lust quickens the conscience. If what the author said, when treating of Islam, be true, that, "civilization certainly owes a large debt to the Saracens," we think that such sentiments constituted the contribution.

MYERS—"This new affection so quickened the King's conscience that he soon became fully convinced that it was his duty to put Catherine aside."

Comment—His duty! For shame! We say to you, Mr. Myers, that this base betrayal of the memory of a noble woman, and this vain effort to redeem the ruined reputation of a lewd and bloody king, should turn you scarlet. We say to you in the words of Queen Catherine: "Woe upon you, and all such false professors."

MYERS—"Henry asked the Pope, Clement VII., to grant him a divorce. The request placed Clement in a very embarrassing position; for if he refused to grant it, he would offend Henry; and if he granted it, he would greatly offend Charles V."

Comment—Thank God, there is one power on earth that will do justice though the heavens fall. Unlike some men, some authors, the horizon of whose activity reaches not beyond expediency and selfishness, the Vicar of Christ in the discharge of his office, consults not the likes and dislikes of men, but solely the justices and judgments of God. The question was: is the marriage valid? To ascertain the facts, not the law, two cardinals were delegated.

The Fall of Wolsey.—

The Opinion of the Universities.—

MYERS—"The question at issue was simply this: Can the Pope annul the law of God?"

Comment—The question at issue was simply not this. There was no question of divine positive law; nor was there any question of annulment of law. There was no proper question of the Pope's power, for the Pope is the supreme court in the Church, and defines his own power. The only fact to be determined was, had the ecclesiastical impediment or impediments been properly dispensed from prior to the marriage? The interference of the universities was simply impertinence. They had not been authorized by the Pope, and had nothing to do with the case. We wish that Mr. Myers would try to understand a little of this.

MYERS—"The opinions of the learned doctors were

so conflicting, and especially in the case of the English universities of Oxford and Cambridge so manifestly tainted with bribery, that nothing save delay resulted from this plan of settlement."

Comment—We were recently told that, "the new affection quickened the King's conscience." It seems now that his conscience was quickened to play the boodle act.

Thomas Cromwell.—

MYERS—"Upon the disgrace of Wolsey, a faithful attendant of his named Thomas Cromwell straightway assumed in Henry's regard the place from which the Cardinal had fallen."

Comment—And now behold Thomas Cromwell! He was faithful; he was unostentatious; he was a wonderful man. Such is the author's tribute. But "faithful" to whom and to what? Not to God and right, but to the King and his wicked ambition. "Caring nothing" for what? "For pomp and parade," and as much for justice and truth. "Wonderful" in what? In villainy. On the ruin of the constitution, he aimed to build royal despotism; and on the ruin of the authoritative Church of Christ, the fawning national establishment.

By his advice and machinations the monasteries were seized. The historian Alzog says: "The work of suppressing the monasteries was completed by an act of parliament in 1539, 'vesting in the crown all property, movable and immovable, of the monastic establishments, which either had already been or should hereafter be suppressed, abolished, or surrendered.' By the year 1540 the work of secularization had been completed; the royal will had been carried out with shocking van-

dalism; works that had cost years of patient and skillful labor, the triumphs of art and the monuments of science, all were destroyed. Nor did the hatred of the ancient faith stop here. The tombs of St. Augustine, the apostle of the Anglo-Saxons, and St. Thomas a'Becket, martyr to his defense of ecclesiastical immunities, were despoiled, and the ashes they contained flung to the winds. Even the tomb of King Alfred, the founder of England's greatness, did not escape the hands of the ravager. * * * The bulk of the sacrilegious plunder went to indemnify the royal visitors and the parasites of the court."

The Breach With Rome.—

MYERS—"The advice of Cromwell was acted upon, and by a series of steps England was swiftly and forever carried out from under the authority of the Roman See."

Comment—Swiftly, yes; but we trust not forever. The way to hell is easy: "Broad is the way, and wide the gate, that leadeth to destruction," and a whole nation can quit the Church and set out upon the road in a day; but the return is difficult, and because of the narrowness of the way, the crowds must come back in single file. Yet there are hopeful signs for England. The Church is strong there, and growing stronger. Religious orders of men are numerous, and there are more religious Sisters now in England than before the monasteries were confiscated.

MYERS—"Henry first virtually cut the Gordian knot by a secret marriage with Anne Boleyn, notwithstanding a Papal decree threatening him with excommunication."

Comment—And thus the English Reformation was begotten, the offspring of unlawful wedlock.

MYERS—"Cranmer, the Cambridge doctor who had advised the King to submit the question of the validity of his union with Catherine to the universities, and who had further served him by writing a book in favor of the divorce, was * * * * made archbishop of Canterbury."

Comment—Henry had no authority to make Cranmer archbishop of Canterbury. These unauthorized proceedings reveal the lawless and desperate origin of the Episcopal Church.

MYERS—"Cranmer at once formed a court, tried the case, and of course declared the King's marriage with Catherine null and void from the very first."

Comment—Why, of course? Because Henry wanted it so declared. You will find on examination that heretical churches are ever the willing tools of temporal princes. The only Church which dares withstand the tyrant is the Catholic Church.

The Act of Supremacy.—

MYERS—"The Pope in great wrath issued a decree excommunicating Henry."

Comment—The Pope was indignant at the villainy of the royal reprobate, who trampled under foot decency, justice, truth, and religion; and with anger like that of our divine Lord when He expelled the buyers and sellers from the temple, he drove from the Church the sacrilegious King.

MYERS—"The act of Supremacy was passed. This statute made Henry the Supreme Head of the Church in England."

Comment—What a comely body the new church must have had to match so beautiful a head!

MYERS—"The Act of Supremacy was passed * * * * turning into Henry's hands the revenues which had hitherto flowed into the coffers of the Roman See."

Comment—And those, too, which had remained at home—all now the fruit of legalized robbery.

MYERS—"A denial of the title given the King by the statute was made high treason."

Comment—And punishable with death.

MYERS—"This statute established the independence of the Anglican Church."

Comment—No, its dependence on the King, and a slave it remains.

We now refer the reader to Mr. Myers' account of the "General Results of the Reformation," and we invite him to try to discover those boasted results in the English Reformation.

"The first * * * result * * * * was the severance of the nations * * * * from * * * * Rome." Granted.

"The second * * * * was the bringing in by it of the principle of religious toleration." Persecution for conscience sake.

"The third result * * * * was its influence upon liberal government." Despotism.

"The Reformation was favorable to intellectual progress." Books were written in defense of the King's divorce and other crimes.

"The Reformation had a purifying effect upon morals." By calling sins, virtues.

"The Reformation has been favorable to material

progress." By converting monasteries into factories and stables. Very good, indeed!

Henry as Supreme Head of the Church.—

MYERS—"The worship of images and relics was condemned."

Comment—"Worship," then and still means honor. The condemnation of honoring the images and relics of saints is a sin against both reason and religion. The great and good should be honored in life and death, and whatever intimately pertains to them.

MYERS—"The entire Bible was now first given in print to the English people in their native tongue."

Comment—That was no great matter, as already they had it in its parts; and they were forbidden to interpret and apply it except as perverted by heretics.

MYERS—"Thus was the English church cared for by its self-appointed shepherd."

Comment—That was the care of a step-mother. The King robbed the people of their faith, and then gave them the Bible which they could not understand; as the Bible to be understood must be interpreted in accordance with the faith. The truth of this latter statement is illustrated by the author's vain effort to understand the Scriptural law regarding marriage. Voltaire, the great French infidel, said, that the most effective way to disseminate infidelity was to interpret the Bible by private judgment.

MYERS—"What the English church should be called under Henry it would be hard to say. It was not Protestant; and it was just as far from being Catholic."

Comment—It was Protestant. Protestantism embraces all those sects that protested against the Catholic

Church in the sixteenth century, or subsequently have sprung from them.

The Suppression of the Monasteries.—

MYERS—"Two royal commissioners were appointed to inspect the monasteries, and make a report on what they might see and learn. If we may believe the report, and it was doubtless in the main truthful, the smaller houses were conducted in a most shameful manner."

Comment—It seems that our author has gone stark mad. "If we can believe the report," he says. Who can believe the report? No man in his right senses can think of believing it. Who were appointed do you think, on the "Royal Commission?" Men of unsullied veracity? Of course not. The King appointed men who would do his bidding, and well they knew what kind of report would please him. Now, our simple author with the feigned credulity of a child in arms, says that he thinks the report was "in the main truthful." The statement is nothing to his credit.

MYERS—"The monks being found guilty of all manner of crimes."

Comment—The monks were found guilty in the report. The royal adulterer and his royal commission accused the monks of licentiousness. Could impudence go further? In like manner the Scribes and Pharisees accused our Lord of being possessed by a devil.

MYERS—"The iniquities practiced in many of the monasteries under the guise of religion were exposed."

Comment—Iniquities have never been practiced in monasteries under the protection of religion. All monks

have not been saints, but religion has never approved, promoted, or countenanced, their faults.

MYERS—"Altogether there were 90 colleges, 110 hospitals, 2,374 chantries and chapels, and 645 monasteries broken up."

Comment—What do you think of that for wholesale robbery and desecration! And that, too, by the founder and head of the English Reformed church. How little must he have cared, not only for God, but for God's little ones, the poor, the feeble, and the sick.

MYERS—"By far the greater portion of the confiscated wealth was distributed among the adherents and favorites of the King. Thus a new nobility was raised up whose interests led them to oppose any return to Rome."

Comment—A new ig-nobility was raised up: and were you to read the book entitled, "History and Fate of Sacrilege," you would be surprised to learn how quickly and terribly the divine wrath visited the families of the villains who accepted the property consecrated to piety and charity. The author of the remarkable work traveled about England beseeching the venal lords to save themselves by a speedy restoration of the ill-gotten goods, and publishing the fate of the first possessors. Many of the lords, terrified at his relations, abandoned the confiscated estates.

Persecution of Catholics and Protestants.—

Comment—It is a remarkable fact well worthy of remembrance that the Reformers who asserted the right of private judgment, persecuted those who by the use of private judgment, disagreed with them.

MYERS—"The most illustrious of the King's victims were the learned Sir Thomas More, and the aged Bishop Fisher."

Comment—These two martyrs were beatified by Pope Leo XIII. The decree of beatification bears date of Dec. 29th, 1886.

Henry's Wives.—

Henry's Death and Character.—

MYERS—"The friends of the Protestant cause have naturally exalted him to the first place among England's Kings, and eulogized him as the most eminent champion of the Reformation."

Comment—But their eulogies have fallen on deaf ears. The world still calls him a monster. The historian Alzog says: "During his reign of thirty-eight years, he ordered the execution of two queens, two cardinals, two archbishops, eighteen bishops, thirteen abbots, five hundred priors and monks, thirty-eight doctors of divinity and laws, twelve dukes and earls, one hundred and sixty-four nobles," etc., etc.

"They eulogized him as the most eminent champion of the Reformation," and yet they tell us that the Reformation introduced civil liberty and religious toleration. We choose to think that they are mistaken, and that the Reformation has the spirit of its founder.

MYERS—"He delivered England from the power of the Papal See, and became the defender of the independence of the national church."

Comment—There never was, never will be, and never can be, an independent national church. A national

church is the creature and slave of the nation. Henry became the autocrat of the dependent national church.

Literature Under Henry VIII. More's Utopia.—

MYERS—"English society was simply a conspiracy of the rich against the poor."

Comment—We think that no drunkard was ever more intemperate in drinking than this man in writing. His prodigality of statement is wonderful. He seems to regard it a virtue to say extravagant things, and to say them recklessly. Does he know that before the Reformation there were no poor-houses in England, and no need for them? The poor were fed at the 615 monasteries, and cared for in the 110 hospitals, which the head of the English Reformation confiscated. Besides, the public conscience judged it every rich man's duty to care for the poor of his neighborhood. England, prior to the Reformation, merited and received the title "Merry England." It is "Merry England" no more. If England was covered over with little rude cottages that might be called huts, it must be remembered that many conveniences which we now regard almost as necessaries of life, were then seldom enjoyed even by the rich.

As to the Utopia,—Blessed Thomas More deplored the evils of his time, and wrote to correct them; but it is not true that "he saw a better future," for he foresaw, and foretold, the calamities the Reformation would introduce.

MYERS—"More told how in this happy republic (Utopia) every person * * * * was allowed to follow what religion he chose."

Comment—Mr. Myers seems not to know that the

imaginary Utopians were not even Christians, but had only natural religion.

MYERS—"Although in his book he had expressed his decided disapproval of persecution for conscience sake * * * * yet he afterwards, driven into reaction by the terrible excesses of the Peasants' War in Germany, and by other popular tumults which seemed to be the outgrowth of the Protestant movement, favored persecution."

Comment—Blessed Thomas More never favored persecution, but he favored the employment of force when necessary to prevent the dissemination of doctrines calculated by their very nature to produce violent results. The social disorders which he saw flowing from the new doctrines convinced him that the abetters of heresy should be restrained. His argument was that it is better to prevent the cause of trouble than correct the effect.

Mr. Myers, while condemning persecution, practices it, for he slanders Blessed Thomas More by imputing to him doctrines that he did not hold.

IV. CHANGES IN CREED AND RITUAL UNDER EDWARD VI.

Events at the Accession.—

Changes in the Religion.—

MYERS—"By a royal decree all pictures and images and crosses were cleared from the churches."

Comment—Which was very natural; for as Christ had departed at the rejection of the Blessed Sacrament, why should his cross remain? Why should the images of his friends, the saints, remain?

MYERS—"The frescoes were covered with whitewash, and the stained glass windows were broken in pieces."

Comment—The consecrated churches had been changed into meeting houses, the people had lost the faith, and the symbols of the Christian mysteries were unintelligible and out of place.

MYERS—"The robe and surplice were cast away."

Comment—For there was no one worthy to wear them.

MYERS—"The use of tapers, holy water, and incense were forbidden."

Comment—Because religion had been naturalized.

MYERS—"The worship (veneration) of the Virgin and the saints was prohibited."

Comment—Having rejected the Son, they now rejected His Mother and His friends.

MYERS—"Belief in Purgatory was denounced."

Comment—And sympathy for the suffering souls departed, ceased.

MYERS—"Prayers for the dead were interdicted."

Comment—And the poor souls beyond the grave were robbed of the help of the living.

MYERS—"The real or bodily presence of Christ in the bread and wine of the sacrament was denied."

Comment—It was not denied, because it had not been asserted. Our brilliant theologian has not yet learned what is the doctrine of the Holy Eucharist.

MYERS—"The prohibition against the marriage of the clergy was annulled."

Comment—Because it requires something more than a sacrament of bread and wine to enable the clergy to practice the evangelical counsel of perpetual chastity.

MYERS—"And the services of the church which had hitherto been conducted in Latin, were ordered to be said in the language of the people."

Comment—The new religion was to be national, and therefore a national language was sufficient. Its creed was to be variable, therefore, a variable living language suited its needs. Yet with characteristic heretical versatility, not many years passed before pictures, crosses, stained glass windows, surplices, tapers, etc., etc., were gradually restored; but the life-giving sacraments and the living truth never returned.

Persecutions to Secure Uniformity.—

MYERS—"The idea of toleration had not yet dawned upon the world, save in the happier moments of some such generous and wide-horizoned soul as his who conceived the Utopia."

Comment—We think that the author's idea is, that the full and perfect light of toleration never dawned upon the mind of man in both his happy and unhappy moments until it illumined the generous and wide-horizoned soul of P. V. N. M. We may be mistaken, but straws in the wind indicate it. But Mr. Myers is wrong.—Constantine, the first Christian Emperor of Rome, placed Christianity and paganism on a perfectly equal footing before the State.

MYERS—"Probably a large majority of the English people were at this time good Catholics."

Comment—Many did not reject the faith. It was stolen from them.

MYERS—"The Princess Mary, * * * * was not allowed to have the Roman service in her own private

chapel. * * * * Idolatry in high places could not be tolerated."

Comment—Nor should mendacity in low places be tolerated; and to call the Sacrifice of the Mass, idolatry, is mendacity.

V. Reaction Under Mary.

Lady Jane Grey.—

Reconciliation With Rome.—

Myers—"The union of the bigotry of Philip with the zeal of Mary resulted in the full re-establishment of the Catholic worship through the realm."

Comment—This is another ugly statement. Bigotry did not, and could not, contribute aught toward the establishment or re-establishment of the Catholic worship. Zeal is a virtue, and was a very necessary virtue for a Catholic monarch in those days.

The Martyrs: Latimer, Ridley, and Cranmer.—

Comment—The following we copy from the historian Alzog: "Of the two hundred and seventy-nine persons executed during Mary's reign, many, like Cranmer and Ridley, were contemptible miscreants; while others, like Latimer, were perfidious knaves. Cranmer who had been making decisions in the fullness of his authority during his whole life, and reversing them again at the bidding of an incontinent king; composing prayer-books under the inspiration of the Holy Ghost, and, at the suggestion of such reformers as Bucer and Peter Martyr correcting the errors which the Holy Ghost had permitted him to insert; signing articles of faith under Henry VIII., and

rejecting them again as false under Edward VI.; went on asserting and denying, as suited his interest and convenience, till the last hour of his life. In the hope of saving his life, he signed no fewer than six retractions, and on each occasion vehemently professed his attachment to the Catholic faith; but, finding that these availed not to secure his pardon, he recalled them all at the moment of execution."

MYERS—"Punishment of heresy was then regarded, by both Catholics and Protestants alike, as a duty which could be neglected by those in authority only at the peril of heaven's displeasure."

Comment—Catholic governments punished turbulent heretics because heresy was a crime against the civil law in every state prior to the Reformation. Heresy is certainly a great crime against God's law: no one will deny it. Prior to the Reformation there was in every country a union of Church and State: the State observed and maintained, the laws of the Church. Heresy was therefore a sin against the State. Not only was the Reformation destructive of Christian faith, and ruinous to immortal souls; but inimical to civil government and civil obedience, as witness the unchristian revolutions and long and bloody wars which heresy introduced.

If Mr. Myers condemns the severe measures used by Catholic monarchs in the execution of the civil laws against heresy and heretics, for the protection of their subjects against the wiles of deceivers; he can find his condemnation in the anger of Moses when he broke the two tables of stone, and ordered the execution of 23,000 Hebrews who had abandoned the worship of God to adore the golden calf.

MYERS—"Catholics and Protestants alike thought that * * * * one's eternal happiness depends upon the correctness of one's opinion as to all the articles of a particular creed."

Comment—The author will never get his eyes open, we fear. Catholics do not believe that salvation in any way depends upon opinions; nor do they believe that a knowledge of "all the articles" of faith is essential to salvation; they believe, however, with our Lord that, "He that believeth not shall be condemned." They also believe that the object of faith, or the things to be believed, is the revelation which God has made, and which the Church proposes, or sets forth, for our acceptance; and they believe that the doctrines which the Church proposes, are the truths which God has revealed, because the Church is infallible; having been instituted for the express purpose of teaching those truths.

The Loss of Calais.—

VI. FINAL ESTABLISHMENT OF PROTESTANTISM UNDER ELIZABETH.

The Queen.—

MYERS—"Along with her good and queenly qualities, Elizabeth had many unamiable traits."

Comment—How Elizabeth who, as the author says, was unamiable and unwomanly; capricious, treacherous, unscrupulous, ungrateful and cruel; deceitful, false, and mendacious; devoid of moral and religious sense; proud, vain, selfish, extravagant, and blasphemous; base, without enthusiasm and without sympathy; could yet possess good and queenly qualities, is an enigma which we must leave to Mr. Myers for solution. A person without moral

and religious sense, must be incapable of moral and religious acts; and the goodness which she possesses must be a physical goodness only, like that possessed by the animal, vegetable, and mineral kingdoms.

Her Ministers.—

Re-establishment of the Reformed Church.—

MYERS—"Parliament, by the two important Acts of Supremacy and Uniformity, relaid the foundations of the Anglican Church * * * * Of course all this was aimed at the pretensions of the Roman See."

Comment—Could anything be more absurd than to refuse obedience to the successor of St. Peter, and proclaim the supremacy of Queen Elizabeth? If there is anything more preposterous in religious history, it is the assertion of the right of private judgment and the decree that all must judge alike. Yet we are seriously informed that these insane acts "relaid the foundations of the Anglican Church."

The Protestant Non-Conformists.—

Mary Stuart, Queen of Scots.—

Comment—The author's treatment of Mary, Queen of Scots, is unworthy of him. In the first place, her devotion to Rizzio is satisfactorily explained by documents found in Italian archives which prove that he was an Italian priest in the guise of a fiddler, come to direct and comfort the queen in her perplexities and sorrows. Impartial historians exonerate her from all complicity in the murder of her cruel, brutal husband, Darnley; and from all disgrace in her marriage with the Earl

of Bothwell, which was effected by threats and violence. Suffice it to say, that she was surrounded by enemies, religious fanatics, and unscrupulous plotters against her life, her throne, and her reputation. We are surprised to find an author so unjust and so unchivalric as to refuse to redeem the slandered reputation of a virtuous, noble, and persecuted woman.

MYERS—"Mary was placed in confinement, and for nineteen years remained a prisoner. During all this time she was the centre of innumerable plots and conspiracies on the part of Catholics, which aimed at setting her upon the English throne. The Pope aided these conspirators by a bull excommunicating Elizabeth."

Comment—The Pope aimed not to aid the conspirators and plotters, but he sought to aid the cause of justice. Elizabeth had taken the Catholic coronation oath, and had flagrantly broken it. She had merited excommunication.

MYERS—"While our sympathies may be enlisted in behalf of the unfortunate victim, our judgment must pronounce her execution necessary not only to the stability of Elizabeth's government, but to the security of the Protestant cause."

Comment—A cause that requires murder for its maintenance, is a bad cause. It seems that Mr. Myers' judgment justifies the murder for the same reason that robbers justify their deeds of blood—violence must be done or the enterprise will fail. An example will illustrate:—After the James and Younger brothers had raided the Northfield, Minn., bank, they lost their way and wandered hopelessly in the Big Woods. One day they apprehended a farm-hand, named Dunnig, whom they com-

pelled to disclose to them their whereabouts, and the way by which they could escape from the state. When all was told, the raiders sat down and deliberated whether they should kill Dunning to prevent his informing the authorities, and their arrest. One eloquent robber was for murder, declaring that his judgment pronounced it necessary. This robber, Mr. Myers, and Queen Elizabeth, seem to have argued from the same principle, that the end justifies the means, and to the same conclusion. The other robbers, however, less bloody than their eloquent comrade, dissented from the judgment of Mr. Myers and "Good Queen Bess," overruled the decision of their murderous companion, and released their captive. Unlike Dunning, who was a stranger to his captors, Mary had come to Elizabeth for protection, and her execution was not only murder, but gross inhospitality and betrayal. That daggers threatened the life of Elizabeth, and furnished motives for her terrible crime, we doubt not; but that the imprisoned Mary was implicated in the plots against Elizabeth, no respectable historian will admit. The trial was the merest mockery; and the judgment as well as the sympathies of impartial men are all on the side of the murdered and slandered Queen.

The end does not justify the means; that is, a good end does not justify evil means. But if a good end cannot justify evil means, much less can an evil end. Let us make the application. England had a political constitution prior to Henry VIII., and it was a Catholic constitution. Henry swore to preserve and defend it; so also did Elizabeth. Both sacrilegiously foreswore themselves, and played the traitor and tyrant. To perpetuate the new order of things treasonably introduced, many murders may have been necessary. Mr. Myers says that this mur-

der was necessary: "Our judgment must pronounce her execution necessary not only to the stability of Elizabeth's government, but to the security of the Protestant cause." The meaning of this is: Treason justifies Murder. A conscience that so reasons is called by theologians, "Conscientia falsa;" and in the domain of morals it plays havoc like to that of a bull in a china shop.

The Invincible Armada.—

MYERS—"The Pope, Sixtus V., blessed the enterprise, which was thus rendered a sort of crusade."

Comment—The blessing of the great Pope declared the expedition just. Elizabeth was illegitimate, a traitor, an apostate, a perjurer, a usurper, a tyrant, and a persecutor. If it was lawful for the United States to interfere in the Spanish government of Cuba, for a better reason might Spain make war on England. But this war was, says the author, a "revengeful and ambitious project of Spain." Very likely revenge and ambition were not entirely absent. Perhaps, too, like passions were not absent from our attack upon Spain. As to, "the craft of Rome," we prefer to call it, "the spleen of Myers." But, continues the professor, "the Catholics in every county repaired to the standard of the lord-lieutenant." Yes, and doubtless the professor would fight for the Sultan of Turkey were he urged by the sight of a gallows to buckle on his armor.

Maritime and Colonial Enterprise.—

The Queen's Death.—

MYERS—"The closing days of Elizabeth's reign were,

to her personally, dark and gloomy. She seemed to be burdened with a secret grief."

Comment—She had reason sufficient for sorrow, but we fear her grief was rather the despair of Judas than the repentance of Peter.

Literature of the Elizabethan Era.

Influences Favorable to Literature.—

Myers—"The years covered by the reign of Elizabeth constitute the most momentous period in history."

Comment—But who were they who made it great? The author says, "The discoveries of Columbus and Copernicus had created * * * * a new heaven and a new earth. Both of them were Catholics. "The New Learning had revealed an unsuspected treasure in the philosophies and literatures of the past." The New Learning was brought to light by Catholics, read, translated, and disseminated by them.

Myers—"Thus everything—the Reformation of religion"—

Comment—Please do tell us one thing that the Reformation reformed.

Myers—"—and the enfranchisement of thought"—

Comment—Thought is always and necessarily free, and cannot be enfranchised because it cannot be disfranchised: but if you mean, sir, that now for the first time men were permitted to freely profess and practice their faith, then go, read over again what you wrote on the "Act of Uniformity," and humbly beg the reader's pardon.

ST. ALBERT'S COLLEGE LIBRARY

My dear sir, you are so stupid and self-contradictory that a child of twelve could lose patience with you. With the exception of Protests, Revolutions, Iconoclasm, and Confiscations, all that you recount, every new and good thing that you mention—new lands and new races of men visited, lost arts re-found, long closed libraries discovered and reopened, "a new heaven and a new earth," etc., etc.,—all are due to the ingenuity of Catholics.

MYERS—"There seemed to be nothing too great or arduous for the English nation to undertake. * * * * They humbled the pride of the strongest monarch in Christendom."

Comment—You even now told us that it was the storms that shattered the Invincible Armada.

MYERS—"They sailed round the globe."

Comment—In the wake of Magellan.

MYERS—"Fisher * * * * writes as follows: 'That Protestantism was a life-giving element in the atmosphere in which the eminent authors of that and of the following ages drew their inspiration, admits of no reasonable doubt. We have only to imagine,'" etc.

Comment—Mr. Fisher will be obliged to do more than imagine before he shall have convinced his opponents. Imagination conduces no more to success in argument than in fishing. The fisher who imagines he catches a whale, often goes to bed on an empty stomach. It was a snag the Fisher caught.

The Writers.—

MYERS—"Having said something of the influence under which they wrote, we will simply add that this age was the age of Shakespeare and Spenser and Bacon."

Comment—And we will simply add that what makes their writings especially interesting and attractive is their Catholic sentiments and traditions. Take away their Catholicity, and their works would be shorn of all their strength and beauty.

MYERS—"Richard Hooker* * * * by relying in his argument upon reason rather than upon authority, did much to promote the cause of religious toleration."

Comment—Hooker was arguing against human authority in matters of faith; that is, that no king or council or human tribunal, has authority to dictate what men should believe; and so far he was right; but in arguing for the sufficiency of reason to determine the faith, he made a fool of himself. Why? Because reason cannot determine that the Bible is the Word of God; cannot determine that it is all of revelation, or only part; cannot determine what is wanting; cannot determine that the Bible has been preserved in its integrity; cannot determine that it has been correctly translated; cannot determine that it has been faithfully copied; cannot, unaided, determine in many cases, its sense. Revelation declares many mysteries, and a mystery is an incomprehensible truth, and therefore not a truth to be investigated and determined by man. How, then, are they to be obtained? On authority. The very definition of faith is belief on authority; and right here is found the difference between faith and knowledge; what is directly perceived by the intellect, is known; what is accepted on the authority of another, is believed. Christian faith, or belief, unlike human faith, believes on the veracity of God revealing; but we don't know what God has revealed, except as the Church proposes it. Therefore the

Church proposing the revealed truth is necessary for Christian faith; and therefore, Hooker made a fool of himself when he said that a man's own reason should determine his belief. But Mr. Hooker is not the only one befuddled: Mr. Myers is as deep in the fog as he; and frequently proves conclusively that he has no distinct conception of Christian faith, and no knowledge of what is essential to an act of faith.

CHAPTER IV.

The Revolt of the Netherlands: Rise of the Dutch Republic.

The Country.—

People: Celt and German.—

Myers—"There came a crisis in the life of the European nations, and they were each called upon to choose between the Old Church and the New, between unworthy subjection and freedom."

Comment—We presume that this fanatical abuse is a specimen of that freedom and enlightenment which the author enjoys as a member of the "New Church." It is the freedom of the bigot, the boor, and the tyrant, who prostitutes his high office of teaching children to the ignoble one of outraging their Catholic sentiments, and infecting their minds with the venom of his own. It is to him that the Teacher and Judge of teachers addresses this warning and threat: "He that shall scandalize one of these little ones that believe in Me, it were better for him that a mill-stone should be hanged about his neck, and that he should be drowned in the depth of the sea."

The Netherlands Under the Dukes of Burgundy.—

State of the Country at the Opening of the Modern Age.—

The Low Countries Under Charles V.—

Myers—"Charles V. saw that the principles of the Reformation were directly opposed to his schemes of despotic government."

Comment—No Catholic is obliged to excuse the cruelty of Charles in order to defend the Church. Charles was a tyrant as everybody knows, who governed very much as suited his pleasure, without asking or taking advice of the Pope; but made war upon him and sacked Rome because the Pope would not obey him. Charles thought that a united Christendom would favor his political projects, and in this is found the reason of his severity toward Protestants. But so far from the principles of the Reformation opposing despotic government, they were eagerly embraced by ambitious monarchs because they were thought to favor it, as they vested supreme civil and religious authority in the temporal ruler, and thus made it easy for him to be an autocrat. No governments have been more despotic than those of England, Sweden, Norway and Russia; and in modern times Germany has been very arbitrary and cruel. Charles forbade the reading of the Scriptures because Protestant versions were being introduced among his Catholic subjects.

Accession of Philip II.—

Myers—"In 1559 Philip set sail for Spain, never to return. His arrival in the peninsula was celebrated by an "auto-da-fe" at Valladolid, festivities consisting in the burning of thirteen persons whom the officers of the Inquisition had condemned as heretics.

Comment—As the Spanish Inquisition tried not only heresy, which was everywhere throughout Europe a capital offense against the state, but also a long list of other crimes, there is very good reason to doubt the nature of the crime for which the thirteen criminals suffered. It is very likely that their crime was conspiracy, rebellion or anarchy as well as heresy.

Burning, strangling, drawing and quartering, etc., were common punishments in England, Germany, France, and elsewhere; and Mr. Myers has no need to get excited over this incident at Valladolid, for, had he been present, he could have beheld similar scenes in London under Elizabeth, in Ireland under William of Orange, in Stockholm under Gustavus Adolphus, in Paris and Berlin. Some of our American Protestant sects taught until recently the doctrine that dissenters should be exterminated, and that it was the duty of the orthodox to demand of the chief executive the enforcement of the doctrine.

The young man of whom our author speaks so feelingly, who going to execution, called upon King Philip for mercy, may have been condemned for a sin which, were it known, would cause Mr. Myers speedily to dry his tears.

Myers—"The number of victims of Charles' persecution has been placed as high as 100,000; but this is doubtless an exaggeration."

Comment—Why mention it, then? We are invited to consult Fisher, and read his fish stories. No, we have got too much of him already. We will place the number executed during the reign of Charles V. at 10,000, or even 15,000; but how does that compare with 72,000, Guizot's estimate, executed by Henry VIII., in a little kingdom of perhaps one tenth the number of subjects over whom Charles ruled.

"Long Live the Beggars."—

Myers—"Philip declared that 'he would rather lose a hundred thousand lives, were they all his own, than

allow the smallest deviation from the standards of the Roman Catholic Church.' "

Comment—It was very heroic in Philip to prefer to die one hundred thousand times than that the Church should suffer injury. This sentiment, if genuine, we most heartily applaud. The martyrs have all died for the faith, and we all should have the martyrs' spirit. But we in no way can approve Philip's imprudence and cruelty. Cruelty is no part of zeal.

Myers—"The name Beggars * * * * became the party designation of the patriot Netherlanders."

Comment—We think that Mr. Myers loves them because they were rebels. Rebel and patriot seem with him synonymous. We will defer our applause until we have examined their right to rebel.

Iconoclasts.—

Myers—"The pent-up indignation of the people (Netherlanders) at length burst forth in an uncontrollable fury. They gathered in great mobs, and arming themselves with whatever implements they could first seize, proceeded to demolish every image they could find in the churches throughout the country."

Comment—The destruction of the images of God's chosen friends, the saints, is impious and devilish. The saints are the most perfect copies of Christ, and present in an imitable form his virtues to men. The perpetrators of the outrage successfully refute the author's assertion that they were patriotic, orderly, peace-loving citizens. The crime was not committed in anger at the Catholics alone, but in hatred of the saints and what they repre-

sented, for we are told that the Iconoclasts dragged the statues of the saints "through the mire of the streets amidst the execrations of the multitude." This was blasphemous, and indicates the spirit of the heretics. It partook of the sacrilege of the murder of the martyrs which had its climax in the execution of the King of Martyrs.

The author cannot find in all history a parallel crime in the uprisings of persecuted Catholics.

The Duke of Alva and the Blood Council.—

William of Orange.—

MYERS—"Never did any people make a more heroic defense of their religious and civil liberties than did the Netherlanders."

Comment—The facility with which heretics pass from sect to sect, and the ease with which they abandon religion and lapse into infidelity, is evidence that they would not fight very hard, or make great sacrifice, from love alone for their peculiar form of creed and worship; but for the enjoyment of civil liberty they will fight, and for exemption from such cruelties as Philip exercised toward them, they fought desperately. If the author seeks an example of admirable devotion to Christianity, combined with heroic fortitude and suffering, he will find it in the loyalty of the Irish people during centuries of persecution.

Isolation of the Provinces.—

The Siege and Sack of Haarlem.—

MYERS—"When intelligence of the fall of Haarlem and the butchery of its inhabitants was carried to Philip,

it so happened that he was suffering from a dangerous sickness; but the news, it is said, acted like a tonic, and the monarch began at once to amend."

Comment—This reads like a rash judgment, for bad news, as well as good, ofttimes acts as a tonic. The bed-ridden invalids in the Galveston hospitals, arose and ran about like well men, when the floods beat against their dwellings. But how does the author know that it was the butchery, rather than the fall of the city, that exhilarated the sick monarch? "It is said." By whom is it said, and is there any reason to accept the saying? Let us be just even to Philip, who was not devoid of virtues. Mr. Myers has much terrible castigation for his enemies, but his rascally friends escape with few or no stripes.

The Siege and Relief of Leyden.—

MYERS—"Mindful of the source whence deliverance had come, the entire remaining population of the place now proceeded to the Cathedral, and there, along with their rescuers, offered up fervent thanksgiving to Him who commands the winds and the waves."

Comment—It seems that the people were "mindful of the source whence deliverance had come." We wonder that the author does not excoriate them for their besotted ignorance and credulity, for he denies "divine interpositions," and calls belief in them superstition.

"The entire remaining population of the place now proceeded to the Cathedral, and there * * * * offered up fervent thanksgiving."

Oh, no, they did not offer up "thanksgiving;" thanks were offered up, not thanksgiving. The grateful soul does not offer up or give thanksgiving.

But as to the Cathedral—it was a Catholic Cathedral, built by Catholic hands and Catholic subscriptions; a Cathedral symbolizing the ancient faith and worship which they had abandoned and repudiated, whose images they had broken, and whose altars they had desecrated and defiled, as the author has so graphically described. A very remarkable and anomalous scene was this return of the Iconoclasts to pray.

The Pacification of Ghent.—

Myers—"Requescens died in 1576. His death was marked by a revolt of the Spanish soldiers. * * * * The mutinous army marched through the land, pillaging city after city, and paying themselves with the spoils. The beautiful city of Antwerp was ruined. The horrible massacre of its inhabitants * * * * caused the awful outbreak to be called the 'Spanish Fury.' 'Almost as many living human beings were dashed out of existence now as there had been statues destroyed in the memorable image-breaking of Antwerp ten years before, an event which sent such a thrill through the heart of Catholic Christendom.'"

Comment—A human life is infinitely more valuable than a statue of stone or bronze, but sacrilege is a greater crime than murder; for one is prompted by anger for man, the other by hate of God.

The Union of Utrecht.—

Myers—"The Prince of Orange * * * * devoted his efforts to effecting a confederation of the Northern States. His endeavors were fortunately crowned with success."

Comment—The author calls the formation of the confederation fortunate because it laid the foundation of the

Protestant Dutch Republic. Now, we wish to remind him that it is not his place to pronounce upon the comparative merits of creeds, nor to say what is fortunate or unfortunate in religious disputes and contests. His judgment is too erratic, and his religion, if he have any, is not of the right kind, to give his opinion any value in our eyes; besides, common sense should dictate that he avoid giving his religious opinions to a class of children of all creeds.

MYERS—"The ten Catholic provinces of the South, although they continued their contest with Philip a little longer, ultimately submitted to Spanish tyranny, and left to their sister states of the North the labor and honor of carrying on the heroic struggle in behalf of civil and religious freedom."

Comment—Were the Southern Catholic provinces contending with the Catholic King for religious liberty? The author must be mixed.

We would ask the author whether there is not more civil liberty, more religious liberty, and more individual and national prosperity, in Catholic Belgium than in Protestant Holland.

The "Ban" and the "Apology."—

MYERS—"Philip published a ban against the Prince of Orange, declaring him an outlaw, and offering to any one who should kill him the pardon of all his sins, the title of nobility, and 25,000 gold crowns."

Comment—Mr. Myers had better go slow. There is a state institution in Ohio, full of manacles, fetters, straitjackets, cribs, etc., wherein unfortunate persons have been long detained for less grievous transgressions of common sense than this. Let us see. So Philip prom-

ised to the slayer of the Prince pardon of all his sins, did he? "Yes," says the bold Myers. But did Philip possess the power of forgiving sins? "No," says the fidgety Myers. Did Philip ever claim that he could forgive sins? "No," says the trembling Myers. What then do you mean, you verbal and inane phenomenon, by this extravagant assertion? "I don't know," says the convicted Myers. If the origin of this invention were ferreted out, it might be found that a man on College Hill dreamed it; and as there are persons who believe in dreams, though they disbelieve "divine interpositions," and love to repeat them, this one was published.

Scholars, learn a lesson from this experience. Of the dreams of visionaries, of the ravings of fanatics, and of the misjudgments and misinterpretations of bigots, are the charges and insinuations against the Church fabricated. A little investigation dispels the illusion, and discloses the author involved in dishonorable entanglements.

Assassination of the Prince of Orange.—

MYERS—"The character of William the Silent is one of the most admirable portrayed in all history."

Comment—If he merited the title "Double-Dealer" which the author says he received; and was so given to the "habit of dissimulation that the Southern provinces would not trust him, we can hardly regard him as "one of the most admirable characters portrayed in all history." But did he deserve the appellation "Double-Dealer?" He surely was full of duplicity. Janssens says, p. 319, Vol. 4: "In the year 1572 Counts John and Lewis of Nassau went to Archbishop Saleutin of Cologne, and wanted him, as

the nearest neighbor of the Netherlands, to obtain from the King of Spain for their brother, the Prince of Orange, an annual revenue equal to the value of the confiscated property. 'If the King,' they declared, 'consents to this plan, the Prince is ready to withdraw voluntarily from the Netherlands, and never again to enter them. He further offers to deliver to the King all the cities which have rebelled, and to restore the Catholic faith in them.'" How is that for duplicity! Gachard says the Prince sent for Elbert Leoninus, one of the most famous professors of Louvain University, and told him among other things that, "if he could gain the King's favor or the Pope's, he would go down on both knees to receive their commands." Morillon, who communicated this to Cardinal Granvelle on the 16th of December, 1572, added: "So far as I can perceive, he would become a Catholic to recover his property."

The Prince's ambition was to establish a Republic with himself at its head; but while using Protestantism as a means, it is doubtful that he loved it as a religion. As to the ban, legal authorities admit the right of King Philip to proceed against the Prince as he did: he was an outlaw in open rebellion.

Prince Maurice: *Sir Philip Sidney.*—

Progress of the War: *Treaty of* 1609.—

MYERS—"The treaty of 1609 was in reality an acknowledgment by Spain of the independence of the United Provinces of the Netherlands. * * * * Thus ended, after a continuance of about forty-one years, one of the most memorable contests of which history has to tell, one of the most heroic struggles that men ever maintained against ecclesiastical and civil despotism."

Comment—There is no more reason for calling Philip's arbitrary measures ecclesiastical despotism, than there is for styling Myers' anti-Catholic diatribes, ecclesiastical despotism. Philip was not more an ecclesiastic than is Myers. He tried, indeed, to ally himself with Catholics, and to identify his cause with the cause of Catholicity, and that from motives selfish and political; very much as Mr. Myers makes common cause with Protestantism to popularize his book and increase its sale.

Philip's spirit, save that he was on the opposite side, resembles that of Mr. Myers. Both are narrow and intolerant, but the latter lacks the power the former possessed. Woe to the Catholics of Ohio were P. V. N. M. their absolute monarch.

Development of the Provinces During the War.—

MYERS—"The contrast * * * * between the United Provinces of the North and the 'obedient provinces of the South, is a most striking and instructive commentary on the advantages of freedom over despotism. The Southern provinces presented a scene of almost utter ruin * * * *the 'rebel provinces' had increased * * * rapidly in population."

Comment—And so the ruin of the South and the prosperity of the North; the southern decrease in population, and the northern increase; all this the author would have us believe was due to the Catholicity of the one, and the Protestantism of the other. For shame! Mr. Myers, for shame! We ask you, which country was the battle-field of the contending armies? Was it not the southern provinces? They certainly were, and thus were they ruined, as Mr. Myers well knows. The constant

fighting also drove out the inhabitants of the South, and many of them unwilling to quit their native land, settled in the northern cities, thus populating the North and depopulating the South. If Catholicity ruined a country, Belgium which is one of the most Catholic countries in the world, would not now be prosperous; and if Catholicity depopulated lands, Belgium would not be the most densely settled of all civilized countries.

MYERS—"No idlers or beggars were allowed a place in the industrious little commonwealth. Monasteries, convents, and abbeys were converted into charitable institutions for the unfortunate, for invalid soldiers, and for the children of those that fell in their country's service."

Comment—Mr. Myers must blot out the Commandment that says: "Thou shalt not steal," before he can justify the forcible seizure and confiscation of monastic property. He cares not whether God be worshiped or not; he applauds the denial to Catholics of the right tc hold property; let only that nondescript thing, called progress, be attained. And this is the spirit of toleration, and the civil and religious freedom which the Reformation introduced? Why, the English language must undergo a reformation, and words convey another meaning, before any but imbeciles and lunatics will admit the author's boasts.

CHAPTER V.

The Huguenot Wars in France.

The Renaissance in France.—

Myers—"The forerunner of the Reformation in France, as almost everywhere else, was the Renaissance."

Comment—And we see no other reason for the connection than that the Renaissance was the revival of paganism in learning, and the Reformation was the revival of paganism in religion, as the event to-day everywhere discloses.—Protestant nations lapsing into infidelity. For example, the United States was certainly a Protestant nation a century ago: now, of 75,000,000 population, only 29,000,000 are church-members, and of these 10,000,000 are Catholics. The remaining 46,000,000 profess no Christian faith. Religious conditions in England, Holland, Scandinavia, and other Protestant countries are not more edifying.

Myers—"It is the changed tone of French literature that we would especially note. As the representative of its freer and more skeptical spirit, stands the famous Rabelais."

Comment—Heretofore Mr. Myers has been trying to identify freedom with the Reformation; now he associates freedom with skepticism, or doubt: "freer and more skeptical." The next logical move will be to league freedom with atheism and materialism. Then there will remain but one step more to be made, take up the cause

of Lucifer with Voltaire, Ingersoll, and Tom Paine, and contend for absolute independence from God.

MYERS—"Rabelais' most noted work is a sort of political romance, in which he attacks particularly the ecclesiastics with the keenest satire and raillery."

Comment—We would commend to the attention of Mr. Myers the fact that atheists, skeptics, and heretics, as well as bad Catholics and criminals generally, as by a natural instinct, both hate and ridicule the Church, her mysteries and ministers. It is in fulfillment of a prophecy. Said Christ to his disciples: "Because you are not of the world, but I have chosen you out of the world, therefore the world hateth you."

MYERS—"Baird * * * * makes the progress of letters, quickening intelligence and widening information, one of the chief causes of the rapid spread in France of the doctrines of the reformers."

Comment—Mr. Baird is as unsound in his reasoning as is Mr. Myers. "By their fruits you shall know them." The French Huguenots have produced no books comparable with the profound productions of Catholics in even mediaeval times.

The Reformation in France.—

MYERS—"Intellectual enfranchisement—we cannot too often repeat it—is sure to lead to religious freedom."

Comment—But though he repeat it until he is black in the face, and his tongue cleave to the roof of his mouth, and his lungs refuse to supply the necessary quantity of wind, the assertion will not have lost one whit of its absurdity. Why, facts more bold to the view than the

Himalaya range, and more numerous than its countless peaks, brand the statement as false and preposterous. Have the learned infidels who have cursed the world with their writings, promoted "religious freedom?" Not at all. Our Saviour lays down the condition of acquiring freedom: "When the Son shall have made you free, you shall be free indeed;" free from the domination of passion; free from hate; free from intolerance. This is the true foundation of religious liberty.

The Reformed Faith Under Francis I. and Henry II.—

Comment—This article treats of the persecution of Protestant subjects by Catholic sovereigns. It is true as related that Francis I. and Henry II. persecuted heretics, but it must not be imagined that sovereigns who would not keep either the Commandments of God or of his Church were actuated by the love of either to attempt to eradicate heresy from their Kingdom. They were simply contending against an influence that threatened to disaffect their subjects and disintegrate the nation. Francis was ever ready to fight for or against the Pope, as his selfish ambition might suggest; and both he and Henry, while persecuting Protestants in France, were favoring them in Germany.

Francis II.—

Catherine de Medici and the Guises.—

The Bourbon Princes and Admiral Coligny.—

The Conspiracy of Amboise.—

The Massacre of Vassy.—

Comment—Religious differences originated the disputes and contentions between the Huguenots and Cath-

olics, but they had little or nothing to do with causing or continuing the series of plots, massacres, and bloody wars that followed. One crime provoked another, and as plots and counterplots, attacks and retaliations, multiplied and were intensified, the hatred of the contestants became extreme. Religious doctrines and differences were forgotten, and injuries endured alone were remembered. The parties seldom fought for a principle, but to satisfy ambition, or gratify revenge. Thus should be explained the " Conspiracy of Amboise," the "Massacre of Vassy," the "Massacre of St. Bartholomew's Day," and many other catastrophes of like nature.

Character of the War.—

The Treaty of St. Germain.—

The Massacre of St. Bartholomew's Day.—

Myers—"On the evening of that day (Aug. 23rd, 1572,) Catherine went to her son, and represented to him that the Huguenots had formed a plot for the assassination of the royal family and the leaders of the Catholic party, and that the utter ruin of their house and cause could be averted only by the immediate destruction of the Protestants within the city walls."

Comment—Catherine was not actuated by religious hate, for she was rather Protestant than Catholic. The King was not impelled by religious animosity, but reluctantly yielded to the persuasion of his mother. All that remains to disprove the charge of religious persecution is to show that they who executed the King's orders were not influenced thereto by considerations of religion.

Myers—"At a preconcerted signal * * * * the Cath-

olics * * * * fell upon the Huguenots, and massacred * * * * all previously marked for slaughter."

Comment—The attacking party fell upon Huguenots and other Catholics. The massacre was not confined to the Huguenots; which fact clearly shows that religion did not provoke the trouble, nor determine the victims.

MYERS—"The head of Coligny was cut off and sent to Rome as a present to the Pope and the Cardinal of Lorraine."

Comment—If lying were punished with decapitation, we fear that Mr. Myers would soon go headless. It is a pity that a historian can be found to keep in circulation such falsehoods.

MYERS—"With the noble-hearted Coligny expired the last hope of the French Reformation."

Comment—The "noble-hearted" Coligny should have reformed himself before attempting the reformation of the French people. He never succeeded in freeing himself from the imputation of having caused the assassination of Duke Francis of Guise.

MYERS—"King Charles himself is said to have joined in the work, and from one of the windows of the Palace of the Louvre to have fired upon the Huguenots as they fled past."

Comment—There is no good foundation for this rumor. The fiction was introduced into a French drama for stage effect, and thus became a popular error.

MYERS—"The entire number of victims throughout the country was probably between 20,000 and 30,000."

Comment—According to the Huguenot Martyrology it is claimed that 15,168 victims fell in twelve principal

cities in France, but the names of only 786 could be obtained. As there is no good reason for thinking that the names of all the victims could not be learned, the latter number probably includes all.

MYERS—"With the capital cleared of Huguenots, orders were issued to the principal cities of France to purge themselves in like manner of heretics."

Comment—On the night of the massacre the King sent orders to all governors of provinces and cities to take measures to prevent similar occurrences in their districts.

MYERS—"Queen Elizabeth put her court in mourning, and her council denounced the slaughter as 'the most heinous act that had occurred in the world since the crucifixion of Jesus Christ.'"

Comment—Yet Queen Elizabeth herself murdered more victims than did all the bloody crowd in St. Bartholomew's Massacre. She slew more men, better men, more cruelly, with a more malicious spirit, and with less provocation. "Let him that is without sin cast the first stone."

MYERS—"The Protestants in the Netherlands * * * * were plunged almost into despair."

Comment—Less affected by the massacre than by the loss of help they had expected.

MYERS—"At Rome the Pope returned public thanks to God for his manifest favor to the Church."

Comment—If a liar should be beaten with stripes, with what scorpions should not righteous indignation pursue and castigate the deliberate historical falsifier? Mr. Myers doubtless well knows that the Pope was informed

at first only of the French King's escape from a conspiracy to take his life. Having no knowledge whatever of the awful massacre, he granted the request of Cardinal of Lorraine, and directed that, in conformity with the time-honored custom at Rome, public thanks should be rendered to God for the safety of the royal family. We say that Mr. Myers doubtless well knows this fact, because it is a matter of history; as is also the severe denunciation with which the Pope condemned the awful crime, when the full account had reached him.

Myers—"The Pope had a medal struck, bearing on one side his own effigy, and on the other a picture of a destroying angel slaying the Huguenots."

Comment—The above explanation knocks the legs from under this charge, and simply proves how disingenuous a writer can be.

A word as to the Huguenots—The loyal French had many reasons for hating them, and especially did Charles and his mother both hate and fear them, for they had become a dangerous and formidable political faction antagonistic to the crown. There is no doubt that they had often plotted to kidnap and assassinate the king; they had drawn entire provinces into rebellion; they had repeatedly refused to pay the customary taxes; and had introduced foreign troops, and such disorder into France as had not been witnessed since the fourteenth century. Charles, enraged at these things, and exhorted by his mother, consented to the massacre. It was hastily contrived and quickly executed. That it was not prompted by religious hate is evident from the statement contained in the Calvinist Martyrology that many of the Huguenots were sent for safety to the convents of the

Celestine and Franciscan orders; and that Catholic bishops, and notably the Bishop of Lisieux, saved many who afterward returned in a body to the Catholic faith. We do not seek to excuse or palliate the crime, but to place the blame where it should be placed.

As to the crocodile tears of the treacherous Elizabeth, suffice it to say, that had the Huguenots dwelt in England she would speedily have put them to torture and to death in punishment, not only of their political machinations, but especially for their violation of the "Act of Uniformity."

MYERS—"Charles' body was often bathed in a bloody sweat, and visions of the slaughtered Huguenots constantly haunted his troubled sleep."

Comment—The fable about the bloody sweat was taken from the drama referred to above, the writer of which says that he is not telling facts, but writing to interest. An eminent physician who examined the case, says that the discoloration of the skin was due to a condition that often attends pulmonary disease, of which affection Charles died after a lingering illness.

Reign of Henry III.—

MYERS—"The Massacre of St. Bartholomew's Day, instead of exterminating heresy in France, only served to rouse the Huguenots to a more determined defense of their faith."

Comment—From an heretical sect the Huguenots had lapsed into a turbulent political faction. They doubtless hated the French government and the Catholic Church incomparably more than they loved Calvinism.

MYERS—"In 1589, the King * * * * was struck down by the avenging dagger of a fanatic Dominican monk."

Comment—The monk was probably insane, for he believed that he had been commissioned by God to kill the King.

Accession of Henry IV.—

MYERS—"Nor did Henry secure without a struggle the crown that was his by right."

Comment—The crown was no one's by right: it was elective. But the coronation oath of the French required that the King defend the Catholic faith and worship; and the national constitution required that the King be himself a Catholic; and Pope Sixtus V. to whom the matter was referred, decided that according to the fundamental laws of the realm, a heretic was unqualified to rule over France. The constitution required Catholicity for eligibility, as the English constitution requires Protestantism, and our constitution native Americanism. How then can Mr. Myers say that Henry of Navarre had a right to the crown?

Henry Turns Catholic.—

The Edict of Nantes.—

Character of Henry IV.'s Reign: His Plans and Death.—

Louis XIII: the Regency.—

Cardinal Richelieu and His Policy.—

MYERS—"Richelieu's own words best indicate how he proposed to use his double authority as cardinal and

prime minister: 'I shall trample all opposition under foot, and then cover all errors with my scarlet robe.' "

Comment—The Church in no way approved the Cardinal's abuse of power, and we shall not defend him. His main purpose was to strengthen, not the Church, but France; he strove less to promote religion than monarchial power; he was much more a politician than an ecclesiastic; much more a prime minister than a cardinal.

Political Power of the Huguenots Crushed.—

Richelieu and the Thirty Years' War.—

MYERS—"Although Richelieu had just crushed French Protestantism, he now gives aid to the Protestant princes of Germany."

Comment—Which fact proves the truth of what we have just said, that Cardinal Richelieu loved France more than he loved the Church.

CHAPTER VI.

The Thirty Years' War.

Nature and Causes of the War.—

Myers—(By the Religious Peace of Augsburg), "Each secular prince was given permission to set up in his dominions either the Catholic or the Lutheran Church, and to drive out all persons who did not accept the State creed. This provision gave rise to much tyranny, and created great bitterness of feeling between the different religious sects,—Catholics, Lutherans, and Calvinists."

Comment—Catholicism is not more a sect than is Mr. Myers a section; and we trust that he, with all his defects, is a whole man. A religious sect is a society of dissenters, while the Catholic Church is integral Christianity.

The Evangelical Union and the Holy League.—

Myers—"Rudolf II., the third in succession from Charles V., unfortunately was just the opposite of his two predecessors, being a bigoted and intolerant Catholic."

Comment—To be denounced as a bigot by a bigot, is complimentary rather than condemnatory. A Catholic prince in Reformation times who does not receive castigation at the hands of the author, was unworthy of his faith. As to Rudolf's having been "instigated by the Jesuits" to extirpate Protestantism (we presume by fire and sword),—it is a flower plucked in dreamland; of which kind of ornament the author has many bouquets.

The Beginning of the War.—

MYERS—"A church which the Protestants maintained they had a right to build * * * * was torn down by the Catholics, and another was closed."

Comment—They were suppressed because they had been erected in direct violation of the "Royal Charter." Protestant hostilities are not justified by the suppression of the two churches.

Suppression of the Bohemian Protestants.—

MYERS—"Though Ferdinand was well known as a violent and bigoted Catholic, the three Protestant electors cast their votes for him."

Comment—When a Protestant prince is active and successful, our author calls him gallant; but when a Catholic prince displays like qualities, he is called violent. So, too, if a Protestant ruler is constant to his purpose, he is styled faithful; while a Catholic leader of fixed resolve, is called bigoted and fanatical. The student will find that, as a rule, Mr. Myers' estimate of Catholics is the very opposite of correct.

Ferdinand II. would have reduced the Protestant princes to submission, and healed the schism between northern and southern Germany, had not France for political reasons, thrown her power and influence on the Protestant side against him, and forced the Peace of Westphalia. But for a time he was very successful.

MYERS—"The Catholics finally obtained possession of all the churches and schools of the exiled sect."

Comment—But does not Mr. Myers remember that these were the very churches and schools which the ex-

iled sect had seized from the Catholics? And why does he record the fact of the Catholics acquiring them, without recording the justification of the acquisition? Why does he not say that it was a case of restoration of stolen property? To have a weak memory may at times be very convenient, but it is not always honorable.

King of Denmark Champions the German Protestants.—

Wallenstein and His System.—

Defeats and Losses of the Protestants.—

Peace of Lüebeck.—

The Edict of Restitution.—

MYERS—"Germany was now completely subjected to the Emperor. Throughout the South the persistent and relentless measures of Ferdinand and the Jesuits had re-established the Roman Catholic worship. The same thing was now to be effected in the North. By what is known as the Edict of Restitution, Ferdinand restored to the Catholics all the ecclesiastical lands and foundations of which possession had been taken by the Protestants since the Treaty of Passau. This decree gave back to the Roman Church two archbishoprics, twelve bishoprics, besides many monasteries and other ecclesiastical foundations. The edict was not, it is true, contrary to the strict letter of the Ecclesiastical Reservation of the Peace of Augsburg."

Comment—Then what is the author sniffling about? If the edict was in conformity with the Ecclesiastical Reservation, as it was with the Seventh Commandment, where is the room for complaint? Is the author angry

because the Jesuits, whom he seems to love as the devil loves holy water, urged the enforcement of the law? But what was the law, the operation of which worked so great hardship? It was an edict requiring the robbers to disgorge the booty.

Mr. Myers condemns the edict, and calls Ferdinand a Shylock, because restitution was hard on the robbers. Bigotry must have gone to seed when it compels an author to espouse the cause of criminals.

Wallenstein Removed From Command.—

Myers—"Though Ferdinand was very loth to part with a general who had rendered his cause such eminent service as had Wallenstein, he was nevertheless forced to yield to the solicitations and threats of the Jesuits and the League, and remove the general from his command."

Comment—It must have been hard for Mr. Myers to admit that the Jesuits really were on the side of mercy, and urgent in their solicitations that the oppressed people should be relieved by the dismissal of the successful general, and the cessation of the enormous contributions that he exacted; but that they may not altogether escape, he tells us that they even threatened the emperor, leaving the reader to infer how unpriestly and scandalous that must have been.

Gustavus Adolphus.—

Comment—While Gustavus Adolphus professed to seek only "the glory of God, and the honor and well-being of Christians," his proclamation still extant, to the Germans, proves that his real object was to place a

Protestant prince (most likely himself) at the head of the empire. His entire conduct and policy show conclusively that this was his real design. He forced the citizens of Augsburg to take the oath of allegiance to the crown of Sweden. He proposed to regard the states of the Elector Frederic of the Palatinate as fiefs of the Swedish Crown; and declined to reinstate that prince unless he would consent to hold them as such. Do not these acts disclose his motives? The truth is, it was ambition, rather than "strong religious convictions and sympathies," that led him across the Baltic.

The Siege and Sack of Magdeburg.—

Myers—"Tilly was besieging the city of Magdeburg, which had dared to resist the Edict of Restitution. * * * In a short time the city was obliged to surrender, and was given up to sack and pillage."

Comment—It is probable that Mr. Myers drained his lachrymal glands to the last drop in weeping over the fate of the Magdeburgers, while composing his graphic and feeling description of the city's ruin. But let us clear away the mist of sorrow, and look calmly at facts. Magdeburg was the robber city—the stronghold of sacrilegious thieves—who having confiscated Catholic Church property, refused to restore it, and dared defy the imperial mandate. It must be remembered, too, that in those days death was often the punishment for theft and treason, and the Magdeburgers' crimes were sacrilegious theft, and civil rebellion. Children were thrown into the flames, we are told; and infants were stabbed at their mothers' breast. We are not surprised, for we remember that English soldiers in Ireland have often

amused themselves with throwing babies into the air, and catching them upon bayonets. The infamous barbarities of Cromwell's praying army, and of William of Orange's freedom-loving followers, have never been surpassed, even by the Indians; and they sometimes were inflicted in punishment of really no crime.

On the contrary, the resistance of Magdeburg was treason, as her seizure of Church property was theft and sacrilege.

Tilly was not by nature a savage, but he led a wild and turbulent army, and doubtless was unable at times to restrain them.

The author complains that the conquering army sang the "Te Deum;" but he should know that they did so in thanksgiving for the victory, not because of the conflagration, much less on account of the carnage. War, at the best, is a bloody and repulsive thing, but when only its shocking features are disclosed and whatever could relieve the livid horror is concealed, the scene becomes ten-fold revolting.

Success of Gustavus.—

MYERS—"Attempting to dispute his march, Tilly was again defeated, and he himself received a fatal wound."

Comment—His dying words were: "In thee, O Lord, have I put my trust, let me not be confounded forever." We think that our author has misjudged the character of Tilly.

Wallenstein Restored to Command.—

Battle of Lützen: Death of Gustavus.—

MYERS—"Throwing himself into the thick of the fight, Gustavus was struck down by a ball. * * * * Thus fell

the noble Gustavus Adolphus. * * * * Beyond all dispute, his is the most heroic and admirable character with which we meet in all the records of the Thirty Years' War."

Comment—We confidently dispute the author's last statement. Gustavus displayed great craft as a statesman, and consummate ability as a general; but his character was admirable for greatness rather than for goodness. Not for a moment had he any intention to establish in Germany either civil or religious liberty. "He was too fond of war," says the author; and "was over-ambitious of militray glory." Yes, he was devoured by ambition. "He was also unselfishly devoted to his country," continues the author. He was an absolute monarch, and regarded his subjects as chattels or tools. "He was ardently attached to the cause of Protestantism." Not if attachment to Protestantism requires detachment from self; for the fact is evident—Gustavus Adolphus was a selfish monarch.

The Assassination of Wallenstein.—

MYERS—"Ferdinand was embarrassed by the suspicious movements of his general Wallenstein. There is good reason to believe that he was at this moment meditating the betrayal of the imperial cause. He was certainly in communication with the Protestant leaders, and the crown of Bohemia had been mentioned as the reward of his treachery. * * * * Ferdinand * * * * ordered the arrest of the traitor, as he firmly believed him to be. But Wallenstein was too formidable an enemy to be captured alive, and he was consequently murdered by three assassins, who fell upon him unexpectedly in his bedchamber."

Comment—The killing of Wallenstein would have been lawful, had they who killed him been commissioned by the emperor, which they had not. They acted without authority, and were murderers and assassins. A traitor too powerful to be publicly apprehended may lawfully be killed privately by a person or persons properly authorized. The departure from the regular method of procedure is justified by necessity.

The War Assumes More of a European Character.—

The Treaty of Westphalia.—

MYERS—"Every prince was to have the right to make his religion the religion of his people, and to banish all who refused to adopt the established creed. * * * * Not any of the Protestant governments, it should be added, ever exercised this right."

Comment—Why not? Was it fear, indifference, or policy, that restrained them? Principle it was not.

Effects of the War Upon Germany.—

MYERS—" 'In character, in intelligence and in morality, the German people were set back two hundred years.' "

Comment—And who was responsible for the disaster? The Protestants, who were trying to introduce a new religion, and to seize and appropriate the Church property of Catholics? or the Catholics, who were fighting for the maintenance of the ancient religion, the Church bequeathed by Christ, and for the retention of their ecclesiastical estate? It should not be difficult to fix the blame.

Conclusion.—

MYERS—"We do not mean to convey the idea that the work of the Protestant Revolution, in the direction of religious toleration, was done. As a matter of fact, no real toleration had yet been reached."

Comment—Then why did the author write: "Not any of the Protestant governments, it should be added, ever exercised the right * * * * to make its religion the religion of the people, and to banish all who refused to adopt the established creed," except it were that the reader should infer that the Protestant governments were actuated by the spirit of toleration?

The author declares that the work of Protestant religious toleration was not yet done, because it had not yet been begun. No man will dispute the logic of this argument. A work cannot be completed before it is commenced. Neither had it been attempted, or even desired, by them. We add, that the Protestant Reformation has been introduced into no country but by the oppression of the Catholic people, and the confiscation of their property. Never did the reformers dream of toleration until they went to colonize lands in which there was an established religion different from their own.

MYERS—"It required the broadening and liberalizing lessons of another full century to bring men to see that the thing they must do is the very thing they ought to do,—to make men tolerant not only in outward conduct, but in spirit."

Comment—He who hates not sin, loves not virtue. The charity by which we love God, makes us hate what offends God; and he who is not saddened by the daily

spectacle of evil, has little love of God. Now, heresy is one of the most prevalent, as it is one of the greatest, sins against God, and evils in society; and he who is tolerant of it is a traitor to God, and an enemy of mankind. Intolerance of heresy should not, indeed, make us intolerant of heretics; but zeal requires that we do what we can to prevent heresy, or to remove it—to save our neighbor if we can. The Catholic princes were obliged in conscience to employ all lawful means to prevent the introduction into their realms of heretical principles, the root of infinite social evils. This, both charity and the civil law demanded. But now that the evil has been introduced, and grown inveterate; and as many heretics know no better, no Catholic prince of a truly Catholic state, did such to-day exist, could employ force without manifest injustice and cruelty. Efforts to coerce the subject, against the dictates of his conscience, is religious persecution, and has ever been condemned by the Church.

FOURTH PERIOD.

The Era of the Political Revolution.

CHAPTER I.

The Ascendency of France Under the Absolute Government of Louis XIV.

The Divine Right of Kings.—

Comment—The theory of "the divine right of kings and passive obedience," holds that the monarch is responsible to God for the use he may make of his power; but it denies that he is responsible to the nation or justiciable by the people. It denies to the nation or the people all right of resistance, not simply to legitimate authority, but to tyranny and oppression.

Another theory, the European democratic theory, makes the persons invested with authority responsible indeed, but to the people alone, and asserts for the people the right to resist their rulers at any time, in any way, and for any reason, they please. It divests government of all moral sanction, deprives obedience of all religious obligation, and makes civil obedience a mere question of expediency, and results necessarily in mobocracy, to use a barbarous term, anarchy, or the despotism of the majority.

The other theory, which is doubtless the true one, makes rulers responsible to God, as all men are, and also to the nation, or to the people. To the people, because they receive their investiture from them, and to

God, because the power with which they are clothed is from him, and remains his.

The doctrine of "the divine right of kings and passive obedience" is Protestant in origin and was brought to its fullest and most systematic developments, in England, in the seventeenth century. It crossed the Channel, into France, where it found a few hesitating and stammering defenders among Catholics under Louis XIV. It was ably refuted by the Jesuit Suarez in his reply to a "Remonstrance for the Divine Right of Kings," by James I. of England; but even the Anglican divines abandoned it in the Revolution of 1688 that expelled James II,. and crowned William and Mary. A Spanish monk who had asserted it in Madrid, under Philip II., was compelled by the Inquisition to retract it publicly in the place where he had asserted it.

If the Church has always asserted with St. Paul that there is no power but from God, she has always maintained that it is a trust to be exercised for the public good, and is forfeited when persistently exercised in a contrary sense.

MYERS—"According to this theory * * * * under no circumstances is it right for them (the subjects) to rebel against his authority, any more than for children to rise against their father."

Comment—So Mr. Myers asserts the divine right of parents, and denies the divine right of kings; and teaches that no matter what a father may do, the children may not withstand him. We fear that the author is radically and hopelessly wrong on both points.

The Basis of Louis XIV.'s Power.—

The Administration of Mazarin.—

Louis XIV. Assumes the Government.—

Colbert.—

The Wars of Louis XIV.—

The War Concerning the Spanish Netherlands.—

The War With Holland.—

Louis is Called Great.—

The Revocation of the Edict of Nantes.—

Comment—Louis XIV. professed Gallicanism, which teaches that secular authority is independent of spiritual authority—the very doctrine that we think Mr. Myers holds, if, indeed, he believes at all in spiritual authority. Louis was on the verge of breaking with the Church, and running into schism, as did Henry VIII. of England. At the time of the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes he was at open war with the Pope. Had he been a loyal son of the Church, he would have consulted the Pope, and would have been advised not to revoke the Edict. Louis in his severity toward the Huguenots was inspired by political motives. He wished to rid the kingdom of a colony within the state, that was not in sympathy with him or the French government. However, his conduct can reflect no discredit upon the Church, and no Catholic is obliged to apologize for it.

MYERS—"By this cruel measure all the Protestant churches were closed, and every Huguenot who refused to embrace the Roman Catholic faith was outlawed."

Comment—The same thing has been done against Catholics, time and again, in the reigns of Henry VIII.,

Edward, and Elizabeth, and in the same country even at a much later period. The Irish Catholics have been so treated until very recently.

MYERS—"Many of the fugitive Huguenots found ultimately a refuge in America; and no other class of emigrants, save the Puritans of England, cast

'Such healthful leaven 'mid the elements
That peopled the new world.'"

Comment—The Huguenots have largely lapsed into infidelity, as all heretics are prone to do. As to the Puritans, no other sect has ever shown a more promising spring-time, or a more barren autumn. The Puritan was rigid enough in moral exactions; and while he was absorbed in his war against the Church, and in clearing away the forests, subduing the soil, making himself a home in the wilderness, and defending it against his savage enemies, he succeeded in keeping himself for the most part, exteriorly at least, within the limits of the moral law.

But with the relaxation of the struggle, the growth of wealth and luxury, discipline was relaxed, and Puritan morality broke down. It never had any interior life, and when its exterior supports were knocked from under it, nothing remained to sustain it.

The failure of Puritanism has very naturally been followed by a fearful reaction of vice and immorality. By condemning celibacy, by sneering at virginity, and by reducing marriage from a sacrament to a civil contract, dissoluble by the order of the civil magistrate, Puritanism undermined the domestic virtues, on which public virtue and the very existence of society depend, and perverted both the public and private conscience.

The War of the Palatinate.—

War of the Spanish Succession.—

Death of the King.—

The Court of Louis XIV.—

Literature Under Louis XIV.—

Decline of the French Monarchy Under Louis XV.—

CHAPTER II.

England Under the Stuarts: The English Revolution.

I. The First Two Stuarts.

1. Reign of James the First.

Union of the Crowns of England and Scotland.—

The King.—

The "Divine Right" of Kings and the "Royal Touch".—

Myers—"The King was believed to possess the power * * * * of healing scrofulous persons by the laying on of hands."

Comment—By whom was it believed that the Protestant King James had the power to cure scrofula? Certainly not by Catholics; and if believed by Protestants, their belief was not only superstitious, but contradictory of their doctrine that the age of miracles is past. This latter doctrine, with a phrase appended, is true: the age of miracles is past, for them. For the working of miracles, membership in the true Church is requisite. St. Edward the Confessor wrought miracles; and some, perhaps, of his saintly successors cured scrofula, or King's evil, by the laying on of hands.

Myers—" 'In the eyes of the English poor it was a visible, palpable attestation of the indefeasible sanctity of the royal line.' "

Comment—By Catholics, the working of miracles is regarded as an argument, though not conclusive, of personal sanctity; but we have never heard that it attested either the defeasible or "indefeasible sanctity of the royal line."

MYERS—"'It placed the sovereignty entirely apart from the categories of mere human institutions.'"

Comment—In the same way that the performance of a miracle by a pedagogue would place school-teaching "entirely apart from the categories of mere human institutions." Are all the externes of insane asylums willing to accept the argument?

However, it would be interesting to know whether Mr. Myers himself regards political sovereignty as a mere human institution. We judge from his writings that he would answer in the affirmative, and thereby prove his superficiality in the domain of politics.

Arabella Stuart: *Sir Walter Raleigh.*—

The Gunpowder Plot.—

Comment—The Catholics of England who had suffered untold persecutions during the preceding reign, had hoped for relief on the accession of James Stuart, whose Catholic mother had been the idol of her co-religionists, and in whose cause many of them had bled. But, alas! All the old terrible laws were re-enacted. Disappointment, despair, and resentment, at length drove to conspiracy twelve frenzied Catholics, every one of whom had personally suffered for his religion: and they resolved to blow into eternity king, lords, and commons.

The Catholic peer, Lord Mounteagle, whom the conspirators wished to spare, and whom they warned not

to attend the session of Parliament on a certain day, fearing impending danger, disclosed the secret warning, and frustrated the plot. Now you have the whole story of the famous "Gunpowder Plot," for which more than a generation of English Catholics bled, and for which the Church will be accused so long as bigots shall write history, though not a score of men in the whole of London knew anything of the conspiracy, prior to the general exposure.

Colonies and Trade Settlements.—

Myers—"In 1620 some Separatists, or Pilgrims, who had found in Holland a temporary refuge from persecution, pushed across the Atlantic, and amidst heroic sufferings and hardships established the first settlement in New England, and laid the foundations of civil and religious liberty in the new World."

Comment—Is this man a fool, or a knave? The Pilgrim Fathers had absolutely no intention of founding a general colony, open to settlers of all creeds and nations. They did not invite, but professedly excluded, those who differed from them in religion. When persons of different religion came among them, they were warned off. If they did not go, they were sent away; if they returned, they were punished. After Mr. Myers' frequent and enthusiastic encomiums on civil and religious liberty we hardly expected to see him descend to this narrow exclusiveness for a portrait of his idol.

Contest Between James and the Commons.—

Literature and Science.—

Myers—"One of the most noteworthy literary labors

of the reign under review was a new translation of the Bible, known as King James' Version. This royal version is the one in general use at the present day."

Comment—The author should have added,—among Protestants. However, as to the necessity or utility of its production, we may be permitted to say that Protestants were in far greater need of an authority to explain to them the meaning of the old version, than they were of a new version unexplained, and for them, inexplicable.

MYERS—"Bacon must be given the first place among the philosophers of the English speaking race. * * * * The schoolmen of the mediaeval age made little or no progress in the discovery of truth."

Comment—Should the student who reads this eulogy of Bacon and disparagement of the Schoolmen, learn in after years, something of Bacon's philosophy and the genius and services of the Schoolmen, he certainly will not envy the intellectual magnitude of the Sage of College Hill.

It is true that Francis Bacon employed the inductive method in the prosecution of scientific discovery; but he did not invent the method, which is as old as the human mind. He met with some success in the domain of the natural sciences, but in philosophy, properly so called, he was a failure; the school he founded being radically false and pernicious, and its tendency toward sensism.

Bacon was not an original genius; and in comparison with the Schoolmen, whether for native ability, intellectual attainments, or services, is almost microscopic. In all likelihood Mr. Myers comprehends neither the truth nor

the error in Bacon's method, and is equally ignorant of the Schoolmen's theology.

2. Reign of Charles the First.

The Petition of Right.—

Charles Rules Without Parliament.—

John Hampden and Ship-Money.—

The Covenanters.—

The Long Parliament.—

Charles' Attempt to Seize the Five Members.—

The Civil War.

The Beginning.—

The Two Parties.—

Oliver Cromwell and His "Ironsides."—

Myers—"His regiment became famous under the name of 'Cromwell's Ironsides.' It was composed entirely of 'men of religion.' Swearing, drinking, and the usual vices of the camp were unknown among them."

Comment—The usual vices were repressed, and were substituted by a morbidity and fanatic hate seldom, if ever, equalled in this world. The bloody outrages of this fanatic band suggest demoniacal possession. A more heartless army of intolerants never sullied the earth. Their savage cruelty in Ireland is a conclusive argument of their interior moral deformity.

The Self-Denying Ordinance.—

The "New Model."—

MYERS—"The army was reduced to 20,000 men—all honest, fervent, God-fearing, psalm-singing Puritans. * * * From Cromwell down to the lowest soldier of the 'New Model,' every man felt called of the Lord to strike down all forms of tyranny in Church and State."

Comment—And directly you shall see how these wolves in sheeps' clothing, these psalm-singing fanatics, who "felt called of the Lord to strike down all forms of tyranny in Church and State," themselves struck down the very constitution of the State, expelled most tyrannically and without a show of justice, a majority of the nation's representatives, and solemnly sanctioned military despotism.

The Battle of Naseby.—

"Pride's Purge."—

Trial and Execution of the King.—

II. THE COMMONWEALTH.

Establishment of the Commonwealth.—

Troubles of the Commonwealth.—

War With Ireland.—

MYERS—"The savage cruelty displayed by Cromwell in crushing the Irish uprising will forever remain as a terrible stain upon his reputation."

Comment—And the reputation of his soldiers, all of whom were "men of religion," "honest, fervent, God-fearing, psalm-singing Puritans."

MYERS—"Yet in his own mind he justified his act."

Comment—And so has every murderer since the days of Cain.

War With Scotland.—

War With the Dutch.—

Cromwell Ejects the Long Parliament.—

MYERS—"Cromwell demanded of Parliament their dissolution, and the calling of a new body. This they refused; whereupon, taking with him a body of soldiers, Cromwell went to the House, and after listening impatiently for a while to the debate, suddenly sprang to his feet, and with bitter reproaches, exclaimed: 'I will put an end to your prating. Get you gone; give place to better men. You are no Parliament. The Lord has done with you.'"

Comment—This is the man who said long prayers, and "felt called of the Lord to strike down all forms of tyranny in Church and State." No sooner does he feel himself securely intrenched with power, than he arrogates to himself unlimited authority, becomes the most tyrannical of tyrants, and excels in arbitrary caprice the high-handed measures of the King he murdered. Cromwell is a specimen of the revolutionists and religious reformers.

Cromwell's Ambition.—

MYERS—"The conviction of Cromwell was that he was called of God to lead the English nation out from under all royal tyranny and priestly despotism into the fullest civil and religious liberty."

Comment—Cromwell was first, last, and all the time, a fanatic; and fanaticism is a form of religious insanity, more or less culpable, the natural consequence of religious enthusiasm undirected by authority. The more Cromwell read the Bible, interpreting it by private judgment, the more perverted did his judgment become; the more determined in error his resolution; and the more dangerous to society his power.

Praise-God Barebone's Parliament.—

MYERS—"What Cromwell wished was to secure to the English people civil and religious liberty."

Comment—Then why did he not? He did not wish to, for when he was at the head of the government, and could have carried out his desire had he ever entertained it, he refused to give civil and religious liberty to Catholics.

The Protectorate.—

Comment—And now, young reader, I wish to impress the following fact deeply in your mind: Protestantism on rejecting the Catholic Church as the teacher and guide, and appealing to man alone, in religious matters. had only two courses to adopt; either to suppose men to be inspired by heaven for the discovery of religious truths, or to subject all religious truths to the examination of fallible reason. To submit religious truths to the judgment of reason was sooner or later to produce indifference, and ultimately infidelity; on the other hand, private inspiration must engender fanaticism. These two opposite products of Protestantism were manifest in the two Cromwells, father and son: Oliver believed him-

self inspired, and became a fanatic; Richard believed himself not inspired, and became religiously indifferent.

Cromwell's Death.—

Richard Cromwell.—

The Restoration.—

Puritan Literature.

It Lights up the Religious Side of the English Revolution.

Myers—"The magnificent Epic of Milton and the unequalled Allegory of Bunyan * * * * were written after the Restoration, but they were both inspired by the same spirit that had struck down Despotism and set up the Commonwealth."

Comment—Or, in other words, that had struck down the Monarchy and set up Despotism; for it must not be imagined that in striking down the Monarchy and seting up the Commonwealth, Cromwell advanced the cause of liberty. Liberty is not promoted by usurpation or any other injustice. The Commonwealth was at least as despotic as the Kingdom; and the Protector was at least as intolerant, and more bloody, than the King.

Myers—"Milton stands as the grandest representative of Puritanism. * * * * All that was truest and grandest in the Puritan character found expression in the moral elevation and religious fervor of this the greatest of Christain epics."

Comment—Dr. Brownson, the foremost of American thinkers and writers, and a convert to our holy faith, thus

speaks of Milton and his works: "Milton had a happy knack of interpreting the thoughts of devils, for he was himself a superb rebel, and a spirit kindred to Satan." And treating of English literature, he thus writes: "English genius half expired with the establishment of the Protestant religion. Shakespeare belongs to the Catholic world, not to the Protestant; for not a thought or expression can be detected in all his works which indicates even a Protestant tendency, and, if not technically a Catholic he was at least formed under Catholic influence and nourished by Catholic traditions."

"Milton was a strange compound of heathenism and Catholicity, with a dash of Puritanism. But the most successful portions of his great poem are those in which he remains true to Catholic tradition."

MYERS—"Pilgrim's Progress, the most admirable allegory in English literature."

Comment—A weary, dreary book, though possessing a strong style.

III. THE RESTORED STUARTS.

1. REIGN OF CHARLES THE SECOND.

Character of the King.—

Punishment of the Regicides.—

The New Model is Disbanded.—

MYERS—"With them Puritanism laid down the sword. It ceased from the long attempt to build up a kingdom of God by force and violence, and fell back on its truer work of building up a kingdom of righteousness in the hearts and consciences of men."

Comment—An institution that mistakes its own work is not divinely commissioned "to build up a kingdom of righteousness in the hearts and consciences of men." Its progress will terminate at the bottom of the pit, whither the blind always lead the blind.

The Conventicle and Five-Mile Acts.—

The Covenanters.—

MYERS—"The tales of the sufferings of the Scotch Covenanters at the hands of the English Protestants are only equalled by the tales of the wrongs and cruelties inflicted upon the Vaudois of the Alps by the French Catholics."

Comment—The Vaudois or Waldenses, after they had desisted from violence towards the Church and her priests and members, were left in peace, and have remained unmolested to this day in the secluded valleys of Piedmont.

As to the persecution which the Scotch Covenanters endured from the English Episcopalians, did it exceed, or even equal, the cruelties which Catholics suffered? Catholics were declared incapable of holding any office of public trust, either civil or military, and disqualified to sue in courts of law or equity, to act as guardians or executors, or to receive any legacy or deed of gift. Every possible means, no matter how infamous, was resorted to to suppress Catholicism, and rouse public indignation against its professors.

The Fire, the Plague, and the Dutch War.—

Charles' Intrigues With Louis XIV.—

The Popish Plot.—

Comment—The Popish Plot was only a rumor that the Catholics of England were conspiring to kill the Protestants. It was a wicked invention without a vestige of foundation to support it. It was conceived in hatred of Catholics, and greatly intensified the persecutions they endured; for the excitement caused by the rumor among the credulous and bigoted populace, effected among other injustices the passage of the Test Act, which excluded Catholics from the House of Peers, and which remained in force until last century.

Origin of the Names Whig and Tory.—

The Habeas Corpus Act.—

The King's Death.—

2. Reign of James the Second.

James' Despotic Course.—

Comment—No one can read this article understandingly without amazement and horror at the popular bigotry, intolerance, and cruelty of the English people toward Catholics and Protestant dissenters. James the Second lost his throne because of an edict of toleration. Pupils, try to understand this:—A Catholic king issues an edict, called the "Declaration of Indulgence," whereby he suspends all the laws against non-conformists; and behold, the nation rises up to denounce the act; the clergy will not read it from their pulpits; seven bishops remonstrate against it, and declare it unconstitutional. They demand a continuance of the bloody persecutions; they refuse to allow the king a royal chapel and Catholic ser-

vices; they conspire to overthrow the government; and they make overtures to a foreigner to betray the realm into his hands. Why, think you? Because of any severity of Judge Jeffries? Oh, no. Because of any real or imaginary league with Louis XIV? No. These were minor offences. The King's unpardonable offense was that he sought to introduce religious toleration, and the clergy and the people would not suffer the change; they would play the traitor first. And now comes the professor with his one-stringed fiddle, and squeaks out his monotonous tune, that the Reformation was the mother of civil and religious liberty.

The Revolution of 1688.—

MYERS—"The prospect of the accession in the near future of a Protestant and freedom-loving Prince and Princess reconciled the people to the misgovernment of their present despotic and Catholic sovereign."

Comment—Under the "freedom-loving Prince" and his gracious Princess the Catholics and non-conformists continued to endure the old-time galling indignities and cruel persecutions.

LITERATURE OF THE RESTORATION.

It Reflects the Immorality of the Age.—

MYERS—"Upon the Restoration * * * * faith gives place to infidelity, sobriety to drunkenness, purity to profligacy, economy to extravagance, Bible-study, psalm-singing, and exhorting to theatre-going, profanity, and carousing."

Comment—Why? Why is virtue succeeded by vice? Because the virtue was not genuine. The false virtue and

"sour-severity of Puritanism" disgusted men, and in their eagerness to quit it, they ran to the opposite excess. Both conditions were extreme: "In medio stat virtus."

Butler's Hudibras.—

"The Corrupt Drama."—

IV. The Orange-Stuarts.

I. Reign of William and Mary.

The Bill of Rights.—

Settlement of the Revenue.—

The Mutiny Act.—

James Attempts to Recover the Throne: Battle of the Boyne.—

Myers—"The Protestant Irish, or Orangemen, as they are called, still keep fresh the memory of the great victory by the celebration, even in the cities of the New World, of the anniversary of the event."

Comment—But unfortunately with so malignant a spirit, and with so manifest an expression of contempt, as commonly to conclude the celebration with riot and bloodshed.

As to the character of William's rule in Ireland we have a word to say. Cromwell had done all in his power to humiliate, and completely debase the Irish people. No nation or class, since the days of the pagan persecutions, had suffered more. Yet William, the "freedom-loving Prince," the "Christian Apostle," surpassed the foul deeds of the merciless Cromwell. Property was confis-

cated to the crown, and the Irish peasantry impoverished. Legal trials were mockeries, and justice was unknown. Bishops were banished, and priests subjected to the most galling restraints in the discharge of their office. Catholic teachers were exiled, and if they returned, were put to death. Catholics were denied the right to educate their children abroad; but were compelled to send them to Protestant schools at home. Catholic orphans were given in charge to Protestant guardians. Apostasy was rewarded by monetary annuities. If the eldest son of a Catholic turned Protestant, he became possessed of the whole property of his parents. Catholics were excluded from all offices of honor and emolument in the state, and were heavily taxed for the support of the Protestant clergy and Protestant schools. These are but a few of the cruelties endured by the Irish under the reign of William and Mary. In the entire history of civilized nations no such monstrous tyranny ever satiated its fury upon an innocent people.

2. Reign of Queen Anne.

War of the Spanish Succession.—

Union of the Parliaments of England and Scotland.—

Death of Queen Anne.—

Literature Under Queen Anne.—

V. England Under the Earlier Hanoverians.

The Sovereign's Loss of Political Influence.—

Myers—"George I. was tolerated by the English for the reason that he represented Protestantism and those

principles of political liberty for which they had so long battled with their Stuart Kings."

Comment—The principles of political liberty, for representing which George was tolerated, may be inferred from the laws enforced against Catholics during two preceding reigns.

Old French and Indian War.—

The American Revolution.—

Legislative Independence of Ireland.—

CHAPTER III.

The Rise of Russia: Peter the Great.

General Remarks.—

Ivan the Terrible.—

Myers—"Ivan the Terrible had 'spasms of remorse' for his deeds, and then would clothe himself in the garb of a penitent, march in the priestly processions, pray himself and ask the prayers of others for the repose of the souls of his victims."

Comment—He did not march in "priestly processions" of the Catholic Church, nor would he have been allowed to. The Russian Church was at this time separate from the Catholic Church, was a schismatic church, and Ivan the Terrible was its head. He ruled it tyrannically, as he ruled the state, and his will in ecclesiastical affairs was law.

Myers—"But in judging Ivan, we ought, as Rambaud fairly urges, to try him by the standards of his own time, and not to forget that 'the sixteenth century is the century of Henry the Eighth, of Ferdinand the Catholic, of Catherine de Medici, of the Inquisition, and of St. Bartholomew.'"

Comment—In enumerating these persons and institutions, it is likely the author's purpose to reflect discredit on Catholicity; but we can easily remove the odium. Henry VIII. ruled with some humanity and success so long as he remained a Catholic; but when he rebelled against the

Church, he became a rebel against God, and a butcher of men. He was the head of the Reformation in England, and the Reformation cannot shake off the odium his deeds attach to it. In like manner, in so far as Ferdinand followed the advice of the Pope in the establishment and conduct of the Spanish Inquisition, he did well; in so far as he departed from it, he did ill. In his excessive punishment of those who threatened his throne, and other criminals, no one will be found to defend him.

Catherine de Medici was not more a Catholic than a Calvinist, and always acted from motives of personal ambition or revenge.

The Massacre of St. Bartholomew was an affair purely political, and had no connection with religion.

The Conquest of Siberia.—

Beginning of the House of Romanof.—

Accession of Peter the Great.—

His Boyhood.—

His Plans.—

The Conquest of Azof.—

Peter's First Visit to the West.—

Peter's Reforms.—

MYERS—"Sophia, who * * * * was suspected of being concerned in the plot (to seize the throne) was compelled to take religious vows, which act effectually removed her from the sphere of politics."

Comment—In the Catholic Church, no applicant for admission into the monastic life is permitted to be re-

ceived except he or she come freely and voluntarily. The Church will not suffer her institutions to be made the instruments of injustice.

Charles XII. of Sweden.—

The Battle of Narva.—

The Founding of St. Petersburg.—

Invasion of Russia by Charles XII.—

The Battle of Pultowa.—

End of Charles' Career.—

Condemnation of Czarowitch Alexis.—

Close of Peter's Reign.—

Peter's Character and Work.—

Memorials of the Great Czar.—

MYERS—"Actuated by the sentiment that has ever led mankind to cherish memorials of its heroes, the Russians have preserved with religious care numberless relics of their great Czar."

Comment—"The sentiment that has ever led mankind to cherish memorials of its heroes," must be a natural sentiment, and true. Why then do Protestants alone of all mankind, while "preserving with religious care numberless relics" of civil and military heroes, of scientists and literary men, of relatives and friends, pay no heed to the relics of Christian heroes, but denounce the veneration of the relics of saints and martyrs as idolatrous? Is not this a contradiction, and a repression of natural sentiment? Or were the Christian heroes inferior, and

less worthy of regard, than civil heroes? And if not, then, we ask, should religion crush out the natural sentiment of the human heart? The natural esteem and reverence for great ability and exalted worth? Certainly not. Our Saviour declares that He came not to destroy, but to fulfill; not to eradicate nature, but to perfect it. Protestantism in thus forbidding and condemning what is innocent and noble in human nature, proves that its origin is not from above.

Reign of Catherine the Great.—

CHAPTER IV.

The Rise of Prussia: Frederick the Great.

The Beginnings of Prussia.—

The Great Elector Frederick William.—

Myers—"He laid the basis of the military power of Prussia by the formation of a standing army, and gave the world to understand that this rising power was to be the fearless champion of Protestantism and religious toleration."

Comment—And the world very well understood that the "rising power" would be the champion of Protestantism so long as politics recommended that course. But as to Protestant "religious toleration" which Prussia was to champion, we need say nothing, for it is more than likely the author will contradict himself soon, and deny what he has just said. You will recall how on a former occasion, he concluded an elaborate eulogium of the introduction by the Reformation of civil and religious liberty with the profound reflection, that in that regard the Reformation had not then completed its work, because it had not begun it. Oh, the profundity of the wisdom of the Sage of College Hill!

Myers—"And gave the world to understand that this rising power was to be the fearless champion of Protestantism and religious toleration, by defying the wrath of Louis XIV."

Comment—For political reasons.

MYERS—"And opening his dominions as an asylum to the Huguenots."

Comment—As a Jew opens his door to a Jew, and a Turk to a Turk. But does a Jew harbor a Gentile, or a Mohammedan a Christian? So, neither did Frederick William "open his dominions as an asylum" to the Catholic exiles from Ireland and England; but Louis XIV did. Mr. Myers should have said that Frederick William loved his friends and hated his enemies. If this be the definition of religious toleration, our lexicographers should be notified.

How the Elector of Brandenburg Acquires the Title of King.—

Frederick William I.—

The "Regiment of Giants."—

The "Tobacco Parliament."—

Frederick William I. as an Administrator.—

Frederick the Great.—

War of the Austrian Succession.—

The Seven Years' War.—

Frederick's Part in the Dismemberment of Poland.—

Death of Frederick the Great.—

Frederick's Work: Prussia Made a New Centre of German Crystallization.—

MYERS—"Prussia and Austria * * * * become bitter rivals, and about them * * * * the smaller neighboring

states gather as prompted by their political and religious tendencies. Austria represents reactionary, despotic Catholicism; Prussia progressive, liberal Protestantism."

Comment—We have now read nearly 600 pages of this book, and we have heard this same tune thumbed over again and again without variation, until we are sick and tired of it. It is a false statement, as devoid of originality as of truth, and no argument can be adduced to support it. Mr. Myers found it somewhere, and because it chimed in with his prejudices, ever since, parrot-like, or phonograph-like, he has been repeating it.

It is pitiful to find our author, a man devoid neither of natural talent nor literary attainments, so warped in his judgment by religious or irreligious prejudices, as to be incapable of writing, not only a good book, but even a harmless one.

CHAPTER V.

The French Revolution.

I. Causes of the Revolution: The States-General of 1789.

Introductory.—

Myers—"The French Revolution is in political what the German Reformation is in ecclesiastical history."

Comment—A revolt; the one against political authority, the other against ecclesiastical authority. Now, revolt against authority is always sinful: to justify a revolt, it is necessary to prove that the authority rebelled against has ceased to exist as authority, and exists only as power, unlawful power. This the author does not do in the case of either the Revolution or Reformation; therefore both stand condemned.

Myers—"The French people in 1789 contended for those same principles that * * * * our fathers maintained in 1776."

Comment—To defend Protestantism successfully, as Mr. Myers sees and admits, it is necessary to defend the French Revolution, which was its political fruit; and so he associates the French Revolution with the American Revolution, and asserts the identity of their principles, and a difference only in their methods. This manoeuvre is very adroit, and is well calculated to enlist your sympathy and approval; but it will not succeed. James Balmes who writes history with an ability and truth to which Mr. Myers is a stranger, speaks thus of the two revolu-

tions:—"If we attentively consider the points of difference between the revolution of the United States and that of France, we shall find that one of the principal points of difference consists in this, that the American revolution was essentially democratic, that of France essentially impious. In the manifestos by which the former was inaugurated, the name of God, of Providence, is everywhere seen; the men engaged in the perilous enterprise of shaking off the yoke of Great Britain, far from blaspheming the Almighty, invoke his assistance, convinced that the cause of independence was the cause of reason and justice. The French began by deifying the leaders of irreligion, overthrowing altars, watering with the blood of priests, the temples, the streets and the scaffolds—the only emblem of revolution recognized by the people, is Atheism, hand in hand with liberty. This folly has borne its fruits—it communicated its fatal contagion to other revolutions in recent times—the new order of things has been inaugurated with sacrilegious crimes; and the proclamation of the rights of man was begun by the profanation of the temples of Him from whom all rights emanate."

MYERS—"'Liberty, Equality and Fraternity' was the motto of the revolution."

Comment—We care not what the motto was. Every villain will speak you fair; and the devil himself oft comes as an angel of light. We want to know what was the spirit of the revolution; and we shall see directly.

Causes of the Revolution.—

Comment—The abuses and extravagances of the Bourbon monarchy had doubtless been great, and great

too, was the immorality of court life. The people were angry and sought redress of grievances. The success of the American Revolution was an exciting cause, quickening the French Revolution; but the real efficient cause was the false principles of liberty, introduced by the Reformation, working out their logical conclusions in practical life. As to the French clergy—if they enjoyed many privileges, it must be admitted that they were the zealous patrons and generous supporters of the French poor.

The Bourbon Monarchy.—

The Nobility.—

The Clergy.—

Comment—First, we are told that, "the clergy formed a decayed feudal hierarchy;" but as we do not know exactly what the author means, it would probably be unprofitable to speculate on the significance of the proposition. "They possessed enormous wealth." Not personally, but corporately. The Church possessed the property and used it in the interest of religion and charity. "This immense property was almost wholly exempt from taxation." Of course it was; just as our Church property is. "The bishops and abbots were usually drawn from the families of the nobles, being attached to the service of the Church rather by its princely revenues and the social distinction conferred by its offices, than by the inducements of piety." But this abuse was the fruit of government interference in the selection of prelates. The Church was not free in France to advance the most worthy priests to the higher offices, and too often court favorites, with little zeal and less piety were promoted to the highest

honors. "'The politician prelates' were characterized by the same odious pride and insolence that marked the lay nobles." Alas, there is some truth in this accusation—let the blame fall where it should. As to the grave and general charges that follow, they are found more frequently in the mouths of the impious and vulgar, than of the honest and decent. The Catholic clergy have ever been in every country the most learned and virtuous portion of its citizens.

The Commons.—

Myers—"The only recognized use (of the people) in the state was to pay feudal services to the lords, tithes to the priests, and imposts to the king."

Comment—Recognized by whom? By money grabbers? By scoffing, heartless infidels? The clergy always respected the people; and in return were respected by them, that is by the respectable portion of them.

Myers—"Louis XV. once deeply wounded the feelings of one of his great lords by gently reproving him 'for shooting peasants as a pastime.'"

Comment—It is a great mistake to write history in this way. An explanation of the circumstances or the occasion of the remark is necessary for its understanding. Murder was always a crime in France.

Myers—"Fenelon says to Louis XIV.: 'Your people are dying of hunger. Instead of money being wrenched from these poor creatures, alms and bread should be given them. France is simply a large hospital, full of woe and empty of food.'"

Comment—Do you know who Fenelon was? He was the Archbishop of Cambray; and we may add that the

French clergy have always had many Fenelons, who dared to upbraid tyrants, and who, in times of distress, spent their goods and themselves in giving relief to the poor people.

MYERS—"When hereafter we see these wretched creatures turning like maddened demons upon those whom they regard as responsible for their sufferings, we must remember their terrible wrongs; and also bear in mind that it is the divine law that the sowers of the wind shall be the reapers of the whirlwind."

Comment—But the law does not work backward: the reapers of the whirlwind have not always sown the wind. Not every one who suffers wrong, brought it upon himself. Not all who endure evil, merited it. Not every executed man is guilty. The Prince of Darkness stirred up the multitudes against our Lord; and our Saviour promised that persecution and worldly hate should ever be the portion of his faithful disciples. It is the devil's rule that the innocent should suffer, and the wicked prosper in this world, so far as he can effect it. The French Revolution was, as regards its radical spirit, anti-Catholic, chaotic and diabolic; and it raged with a devil's instinctive malice against Christ and his Church. Mr. Myers seems to think that the Revolutionists in their bloody excesses were actuated by a merely human passion of revenge against their former oppressors. We ask, then, why did they rail against the Almighty? Why did they blaspheme God? Why did they enact a law to exile God from the world? All this, and much yet to be told, disproves the author's supposition.

Revolutionary Spirit of French Philosophy.—

Comment—Voltaire and Rousseau were the two chiefs

of the army of satan. Voltaire was an infidel, and probably as much of an atheist, too, as a man can become, and took a solemn oath "to devote his whole life to the work of destroying Christianity, and with it all positive religion." Rousseau waged war with malignant hate on the divine institutions of society, Church, State, and family, without which men were worse than savages. When Voltaire declared: "I have accomplished more in my day than either Luther or Calvin," he should have added, "and I have continued their work."

Influence of the American Revolution.—

MYERS—"In this young Republic of the western world they saw realized the Arcadia of their philosophy."

Comment—The Bible says: "A man dug a pit and fell into it." Young reader, behold an illustration. Mr. Myers says that the sentiments of the infidel philosophers were popularly accepted, and formed the animus of the Revolution: "The names of the great infidel writers, Rousseau and Voltaire, suggest at once its prevalent tone and spirit." Very well. Now what did Voltaire seek? The destruction of Christianity and all positive religion. What was Rousseau's aim? The abolition of Church, State and family. Were all, or any of these things accomplished by the American Revolution? No. How then was the dream of the French infidel philosophers realized? It was not realized. How was the Arcadia of their philosophy realized? Not at all. The stupidity of the philosophers is equaled by the stupidity of the historian.

"After us the Deluge."—

Calling of the States—General.—

II. The National or Constituent Assembly.

The States-General Changed into the National Assembly.—

Prominent Men in the Assembly.—

Myers—"Belonging by birth to the same order (the nobility), but sitting now as a deputy of the commons, was Mirabeau, a large-headed, dissolute, unscrupulous man, an impetuous orator, the mouth-piece of the Revolution * * * * He had already demonstrated his fitness for leadership."

Comment—He had already demonstrated his unfitness for leadership. A "dissolute, unscrupulous man" may be able to lead men, but he is not fit to lead them. He is a poor philosopher who confounds fitness with ability.

Origin of the Revolutionary Commune of Paris.—

The Formation of the National Guards.—

Storming of the Bastile.—

Myers—"The destruction by the Paris mob, of the Bastile, is in the French Revolution what the burning of the Papal bull by Luther was to the Reformation."

Comment—It launched the catastrophe. The revolutionists liberated seven prisoners from the Bastile, erected 44,000 guillotines, and murdered hundreds of thousands of innocent victims. A corresponding havoc in the spiritual order completes the picture of the Reformation.

Myers—"The destruction by the Paris mob, of the Bastile * * * * was the death-knell not only of Bourbon despotism in France, but of royal tyranny everywhere."

Comment—There was no Bourbon despotism at the time of the Revolution. Louis XVI. was an exemplary monarch. And as to the Revolution destroying tyranny everywhere, it introduced at home the worst form of tyranny, the tryanny of the mob, and disseminated it abroad. "None are so blind as they who will not see."

MYERS—"When the news reached England, the great statesman Fox, perceiving its significance for liberty, exclaimed, 'How much is this the greatest event that ever happened in the world, and how much the best.' "

Comment—It was fortunate for Europe that Pitt did not see through Fox's eyes, and could not detect the salutary influence of the Revolution; otherwise, England might have remained neutral, and Napoleon been victorious at Waterloo.

When "men gather grapes from thorns and figs from thistles," then may revolutions like that of France produce salutary effects.

The Abolition of Privileges.—

"To Versailles."—

The Royal Family Taken to Paris.—

The Emigration of the Nobles.—

The Flight of the King.—

MYERS—"The King was kept a close prisoner in the Tuileries. The National Assembly were making sweeping reforms both in Church and State."

Comment—The National Assembly had no ecclesiastical authority, and could make no changes in the Church; but it could play the tyrant, and oppress the Church, which

it did. To steal Church revenues, to confiscate Church property, and to exile the religious, are with our professor, reforms. Like the Mafia, he has a language of his own.

The Clubs: Jacobins and Cordeliers.—

The New Constitution.—

III. The Legislative Assembly.

The Three Parties.—

The Temper of the Assembly.—

War With the Old Monarchies.—

Myers—"The old monarchies of Europe resolved * * * * that the heretical French doctrines respecting the sovereignty of the People and the Rights of Man should be proved false by the power of royal armies."

Comment—It is not necessary to resort to force to disprove the infidel trash composed by Thomas Paine, and called, The Rights of Man. The refutation of the foolishness is easily procured, but how will you persuade the hot-headed anarchist to accept your proofs? A revolutionist, truncated by the loss of faith and grace, and frenzied with hate and pride, is not a docile student.

The Massacre of the Swiss Guards.—

Myers—"Meanwhile the gathering hordes of the capital were swollen by the arrival of desperate men from all parts of France. From the South came the 'six hundred Marseillese who know how to die.'"

Comment—The "hordes of the capital," the "bands of desperate men from all parts of France," and the "six

hundred Marseillese," were the very men who knew not how to die because they knew not how to live, knew not the worth and meaning of life. These infatuated and furious hoodlums, whom Mr. Myers takes to his bosom as apostles of liberty, have merited neither applause, approval, nor apology.

The Marseillese came with orders to "strike down the tyrant." Their municipal authorities would have done better to send a pig to teach cleanliness.

The Flight of Lafayette.—

MYERS—"The army of the allies hurried on towards the capital, to avenge the slaughter of the royal guards and rescue the King. The rapid advance of the enemy alarmed the Revolutionists. That the invaders might receive no aid from royalists within, all persons suspected of sympathizing with the King were seized and hurried to prison. The jails of the capital were crowded with aristocrats and other supposed enemies of the Revolution."

Comment—The Revolutionists had stormed the Bastile to rescue the prisoners whom they imagined by thousands to be groaning in dark dungeons, manacled and fettered—and found seven. Now, all the jails of the city are crowded with good men, whose only offense is sympathy with a lawful and worthy monarch, overwhelmed with insult and outrage. Let the reader decide whether the prior or subsequent condition was the more tryannous.

We quote again the words of our author: "The French Revolution is in political, what the German Reformation is in ecclesiastical history."

MYERS—"Lafayette strove to moderate the fury of the people, to save the King and the new constitution, and to hold the country back from the anarchy into which he saw it was drifting. But his moderation offended the people; his popularity and influence were lost, and he was obliged to flee for his life."

Comment—Yet, says the author, the French people contended for the same principles that our fathers maintained in 1776. Were our fathers anarchists?

The Massacre of September ("Jail Delivery").—

MYERS—" 'We must stop the enemy,' cried Danton, 'by striking terror into the royalists.' To this end the most atrocious measures were now adopted. It was resolved that all the royalists confined in the jails of the capital should be murdered."

Comment—Yet "The French Revolution is in political, what the German Reformation is in ecclesiastical history."

Defeat of the Allies.—

IV. THE NATIONAL CONVENTION.

Parties in the Convention.—

The Establishment of the Republic.—

MYERS—..A 'stentorian trumpeter' was deputed to proclaim the decree of the Convention, beneath the Temple Tower where the royal family were confined. The King was reading, heard the decree, for the dead alone could be deaf to the republican trumpet, but 'did not lift his eyes from his book.' Thus fell Royalty in France, amidst the 'utmost enthusiasm.' "

Comment—To be succeeded by the black night of anarchy, the Reign of Terror, the dictatorship, the abolition of Christianity, popular tumults, tyranny, bloodshed, and revolutions, down almost to the present day. Oh, how slow is France to learn; how slow are historians to learn, that violence and injustice pave not the way to liberty and peace.

Trial and Execution of the King.—

Comment—The historian Alzog wrote: "Against the judicial murder by Frenchmen of one of the best of French Kings no determined opposition was made in the Convention, which was chiefly composed of Jacobins and Girondists. 'I forgive the authors of my death,' said this descendant of St. Louis with his last breath; 'may my blood never be avenged upon France.' These noble words will remain for all time a splendid testimony to the magnanimity and Christian resignation of this unfortunate prince. His queen, Maria Antoinette, the daughter of Maria Teresa, carried herself during the last days of her life, and amid the trying scenes of execution, with the heroic fortitude of a martyr and the calm dignity of a saint."

Coalition Against France.—

The Revolutionary Tribunal and Committee of Public Safety.—

Myers—"The Committee of Public Safety contained the germ of a Roman Triumvirate, and the Revolutionary Tribunal that of a Spanish Inquisition."

Comment—When the Spanish Inquisition is referred to by a non-Catholic author there is generally intended

some reflection on the Church, so that it is necessary, or at least expedient, for the Catholic to reply. Let it therefore be well understood that Rome did not approve of the excessive rigor of the Spanish Inquisition. In proof of which statement we cite the fact, that coeval with the Spanish Inquisition was the Roman Inquisition; and, although the Apostolic See was occupied during that time by popes of extreme rigor and severity in all that relates to civil and ecclesiastical administration, never did the Roman tribunal pronounce sentence of capital punishment. The fact is worthy of remembrance.

The Fall of the Girondists.—

The Reign of Terror.

Opening of the Reign of Terror.—

Myers—"All aristocrats, all persons suspected of lukewarmness in the cause of liberty, were ordered to the guillotine."

Comment—The cause represented by Marat, Danton and Robespierre, was not the cause of liberty, but the cause of tyranny, autocracy, and license. Things should be called by their right names.

Charlotte Corday: Assassination of Marat.

Myers—"The atrocious tyranny of the revolutionary leaders of Paris caused the inhabitants of almost all the departments of the country to fly to arms. At this moment appeared the Joan of Arc of the Revolution."

Comment—The comparison of Charlotte Corday with Joan of Arc is most unhappy. The act of Charlotte was

murder, and, how-much-soever provoked, absolutely indefensible. On the contrary, Joan of Arc was legally commissioned by the King, and all her military acts were free from moral stain.

Events After the Death of Marat.—

Execution of Marie Antoinette.—

Madame Roland.—

Sweeping Changes and Reforms.—

Abolition of Christianity.—

MYERS—"Bishop Gobel * * * * appeared before the National Convention, and being introduced to its members, spoke as follows: 'When the people wanted bishops, I suffered myself to be made a bishop. I cease to be so when the people do not desire to have any.'"

Comment—God in giving to a boy a vocation to the priesthood, does not forthwith make him a saint; nor does he miraculously or instantaneously sanctify him on the reception of Holy Orders. Sanctity is acquired by co-operation with God's grace, and is preserved by perseverance. Among the thousands of priests who died for the faith during the progress of the Revolution (six hundred of whom were slaughtered in Avignon alone), a few Judases were found, conspicuous among whom was Gobel. The apostate was quickly overtaken by divine justice. He was arrested and imprisoned, and during the months of his confinement, came to himself, and exhibited the bitterest regret for the scandalous crime that he had committed. On April 13th, he was executed by those who had provoked him to sin.

MYERS—"Nov. 7, 1793, the abolition of the Christian religion in France (took place). The churches of Paris and of a great number of other cities * * * * were now closed, and the treasures of their altars and shrines confiscated to the State. The bells were melted down into cannon and muskets. The images of the Virgin and the Christ were torn down, and the busts of Marat and other patriots set up in their stead. And as the emancipation of the world was now to be wrought, not by the Cross, but by the guillotine, that instrument took the place of the crucifix, and was called the Holy Guillotine. All the visible symbols of the ancient religion were destroyed. All emblems of hope in the cemeteries were obliterated, and over their gates were inscribed the words, 'Death is eternal sleep.'"

Comment—Having now witnessed the fury of the whirlwind of the Revolution, and its destruction of life, property, institutions, and laws, the reader is prepared to examine the comparison instituted by the author, of the Revolution with the Reformation. The Reformation rejected all unwritten Revelation; rejected parts of the inspired Scriptures; rejected the Church of Christ; rejected the Mother of God. It forbade the honoring of the saints whom God honors; it forbade the veneration of the relics of the martyrs and other Christian heroes; it forbade all reverence for the crucifix and the memorials of our Saviour's passion and death. It denied the Sacrifice of the Mass, and made the Church of God a meeting-house of men; it denied Holy Orders, and made the priest a layman; it denied the Sacrament of Matrimony and made marriage a civil and almost a profane rite, a mere human contract, dissoluble at will; it denied the

Sacrament of Extreme Unction, and left the sick to die without spiritual consolation; it denied the Holy Eucharist, and fed its children on the bread that perisheth; it denied the Sacrament of Penance, and left sinners to live in sin and die in despair or presumption; it denied the Sacrament of Confirmation, and deprived its followers of the indwelling of the Holy Ghost; it has sometimes virtually, and even formally, denied the Sacrament of Baptism without which heaven remains closed to man. It robbed its disciples of well nigh everything, and restored nothing, and called the destruction and desolation, religious liberty and progress.

In like manner, when the Revolution had overthrown the government and effected anarchy, it called it freedom; when it had suppressed Christianity, and established infidelity, it called it wisdom; when it had slain the officials, exiled the nobles, and confiscated the property of the rich, it called it equality.

Mr. Myers in calling attention to the striking similarity between the two great catastrophies, has evinced a seeming perspicacity that reflects credit upon his ability. But we wonder whether he understands what he has said.

The Worship of Reason.—

Myers—"One of the chiefs of the Commune, addressing the members of the assembly, while he pointed to the Goddess (a disreputable and notorious character), said: 'France has abandoned inanimate idols for Reason, for that animated image, the masterpiecé of nature.'"

Comment—This shocking scene was enacted in the

Cathedral of Notre Dame at Paris; and it recalls our Saviour's words, "the abomination of desolation standing in the holy place." The reader will not be surprised to learn that within two years from this date, Nov. 10, 1793, 59,000 marriages were dissolved in Paris alone. To this cause and effect the scriptural passage from the Prophet Osee is applicable:

"They shall sow wind, and reap a whirlwind."

MYERS—"The example of Paris was followed throughout France. Churches were everywhere converted into temples of the new worship."

Comment—This statement is not literally true. The new worship was not universally introduced. Several provinces remained loyal to Christ and to his Church, and by their armed resistance, concluded with the Revolutionists an honorable peace which gave them freedom of Catholic worship.

Fall of Hebert and Danton.—

Worship of the Supreme Being.—

MYERS—"One of the first acts of the dictator was to give France a new religion in the place of the worship of Reason. Robespierre wished to sweep away Christianity as a superstition, but he would stop at Deism."

Comment—Christianity is the religion of Christ, and has in it nothing of superstition. We leave the obloquy of the invention and expression of the impiety to those who are guilty.

The Terror at Paris.—

Massacres in the Provinces.—

The Fall of Robespierre.—

The Reaction.—

Successes of the French Arms.—

Napoleon Defends the Convention.—

V. The Directory.

The Republic Becomes Aggressive.—

Myers—"The Revolution, having accomplished its work in France, having there destroyed royal despotism and abolished class privilege, now set itself about fulfilling its early promise of giving liberty to all peoples."

Comment—The Revolution has done its work in France; let us count the result. Of the public institutions existing before, few escaped. The arbitrary power of the monarch has passed away. The oppressive privileges of aristocracy, are gone forever. The iniquities and cruelties of the old penal laws and the old criminal procedure, have vanished. These are the sum of its conquests.

And what the Revolution did for France, it did, in greater or less measure, for much of continental Europe. If it had stopped with the correction of abuses, none could justly condemn it; but it did not stop there; it carried its infidel principles to their logical conclusion, and transgressed not less the Ten Commandments than the political constitution. It rejected the authority of God and of the State; and abused most tyrannically the inalienable and sacred rights of individuals, "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness." It destroyed royalty by destroying the royal family; it eradicated class privileges by slaughter and exile of the aristocracy and

clergy, and the confiscation of their legal property. It removed abuses by the perpetration of incomparably greater ones; and inflicted persecution or death on virtuous citizens for refusing to participate in its crimes. The remedy was a thousand-fold worse than the disease, and has paralyzed the body politic. Ever since has France stood unsteadily, and has tottered in her national movements. The violence that justice suffered, shocked, alienated, and isolated the French people, one from another; the public conscience is lethargic; public spirit is weak; and the classes of French society stand aloof from one another, and are inimical; and why? Because the Ten Commandments which are the bonds of society have been broken. What wonder then that France, divided against itself, should have for nearly a century swung back and forth between monarchy, anarchy, and republicanism?

MYERS—"The republics established (by France) were indeed, short lived; for the times were not yet ripe for the complete triumph of democratic ideas. But a great gain for freedom was made."

Comment—It is very much to be doubted, to say the least, whether violent attacks upon constituted authority, resulting in radical constitutional changes, can ever be salutary in their effects.

The Plans of the Directory.—

Napoleon's Italian Campaign.—

Treaty of Campo Formio.—

Napoleon's Campaign in Egypt.—

Establishment of the Tiberine, the Helvetic, and the Parthenopaean Republics.—

Comment—These violent invasions, forcible seizures and radical constitutional changes, wrought by the Revolutionists in the surrounding countries, are not susceptible of justification. The law, "Thou shalt not steal," binds nations as well as individuals.

The Reaction: Napoleon Overthrows the Directory.—

MYERS—"The French Revolution had at last brought forth its Cromwell. Napoleon was master of France. The French Republic was at an end, and what was distinctively called the French Revolution was over."

Comment—Extremes meet. The Republic is succeeded by the Empire, and they who would have none to rule over them, are obliged to call in a dictator to save them from themselves. But why this necessity, a necessity not only at this time and place, but everywhere and always? Because there is no liberty without law; liberty being, as Cicero says, slavery to law. "In the same way it may be said, that the liberty of the intellect consists in being the slave of truth; and the liberty of the will in being the slave of virtue."

Secret of Napoleon's Power.—

CHAPTER VI.

The Consulate and the First Empire: France Since the Second Restoration.

I. The Consulate and the Empire.

The Veiled Military Despotism.—

Myers—"After the overthrow of the Directorial government, a new constitution—the fourth since the year 1789—was prepared, and having been submitted to the approval of the people, was heartily endorsed."

Comment—Here is seen another striking resemblance between the political and ecclesiastical revolutions:—Four national constitutions succeeded one another in a single decade of years; and with like rapidity were the symbols of the reformed faith devised, accepted, and rejected. The latter phenomenon led Bossuet to compose a book entitled, "The Variations of Protestantism," in which appears this succinct argument: "Protestantism changes, therefore it is not true, for the truth changes not."

Myers—"France was still called a republic, but it was such a republic as Rome was under Julius Caesar or Augustus. The republican names and forms merely veiled a government as absolute and personal as that of Louis XIV.,—in a word, a military despotism."

Comment—"Iniquitas mentita est sibi,"—Iniquity hath lied to itself. How could the Revolution with its impious principles fulfil its promise to give freedom? The promises of the Revolution were mighty; but their ful-

fillment, worse than nothing. The resemblance of the two revolutions still continues.

Wars of the First Consul.—

His Works of Peace: the Code Napoleon.—

MYERS—"The Code Napoleon * * * * secured the work of the Revolution."

Comment—Napoleon on assuming the reins of government, entered into a political desert, and the law and order he established was his work, not that of the Revolutionists. He built upon the ruins of the Revolution, not with those ruins.

MYERS—"It swept away the unequal, iniquitous, oppressive customs, regulations, decrees, and laws that were an inheritance of the feudal ages."

Comment—No, it did not, for already had they been swept away by the Revolution, and with them much that was just, charitable, and sacred.

MYERS—"It recognized the equality in the eye of the law of noble and peasant."

Comment—It did not, for there was no noble. The nobility long since had been abolished. To attribute the Code Napoleon to the Revolution is like attributing a wheat harvest to the flames that destroyed the first sowing, and necessitated a second planting. We readily admit the excellence of much of the Napoleonic legislation, but we object to attributing it to the insane fury of the Revolution.

Napoleon Made Consul for Life.—

Plots Against His Life.—

Napoleon Proclaimed Emperor.—

MYERS—"The Pope poured upon the head of the kneeling Emperor the holy oil, and invested him with the imperial sceptre; but when he would have placed the crown upon his head, Napoleon checked him, and taking the diadem from the Pope crowned himself with his own hands."

Comment—Napoleon crowned himself lest the people would be angered by the performance of the ceremony by the Pope. The Pope was not ignorant of the Emperor's purpose, and did not attempt to crown him.

Surrounding Republics Changed Into Kingdoms.—

MYERS—"Napoleon was right when he said that a revolution in France was sure to be followed by a revolution throughout Europe. As France, a republic, would make all states republics, so France a monarchy, would make all nations monarchies."

Comment—Napoleon was a false prophet; and facts then and now confute his prediction. France has been a republic without interruption for more than thirty years; while the kingdoms about her have remained kingdoms.

MYERS—"Within five years from the time that the government of France assumed an imperial form, all the surrounding republics raised by the revolutionary ideas and armies of France had been transformed into monarchies dependent upon France, or had become a component part of the French Empire. * * * * Thus was the political work of the Revolution undone. Political liberty was taken away."

Comment—From which statement it might be inferred that the peculiar tendency of the Revolution was

toward the establishment of liberty. Nothing could be further from the truth. No government was ever more despotic and unjust than the unstable governments of the Revolution; no leaders were ever more tyrannical and bloody than Marat, Hebert, Danton, and Robespierre. From first to last, from the murder of the king, to the coronation of the Emperor, liberty was an exile under ban.

The Wars of Napoleon.—

Austerlitz: End of the Holy Roman Empire.—

Trafalgar.—

Jena and Auerstadt.—

Eylau and Friedland.—

The Continental System: the Berlin and Milan Decrees.—

Beginning of the Peninsular Wars.—

Second Campaign Against Austria.—

The Papal States and Holland Joined to the French Empire.—

Myers—"That Napoleon cared but little for the thunders of the Church is shown by his treatment of the Pope. Pius VII. opposing his continental system, the Emperor incorporated the Papal States with the French Empire. The Pope thereupon excommunicated Napoleon, who straightway arrested the Pontiff, and dragged him over the Alps into France. He held him in captivity for four years, moving him from place to place, and part of the time limiting him to prison fare."

Comment—Dr. Brownson speaking of the protection God ever extends to His Church, says: "Napoleon

laughed at the idea of an excommunication of a sovereign by the Pope in the nineteenth century, and asked, sneeringly, if the old man expected that the thunders of the Church would cause the muskets to fall from the hands of his soldiers. He had his answer on his retreat from Moscow, when the muskets did literally fall from their hands."

Napoleon's Second Marriage.—

MYERS—"The year following his triumph over Francis I. of Austria, Napoleon divorced his wife Josephine, in order to form a new alliance with Maria Louisa, Archduchess of Austria. The fond and faithful Josephine bowed meekly to the will of her lord, and went into sorrowful exile from his palace."

Comment—What is the meaning of this effusion of sentimentality? If "the fond and faithful Josephine bowed meekly to the will of her lord" to express her approval of, or even acquiescence in, his second marriage, she became a party to the crime, and most faithless to God, who abhors all sacrilege, its perpetrators and accessories.

Napoleon at the Summit of his Power.—

Elements of Weakness in the Empire.—

The Invasion of Russia.—

"The Battle of the Nations."—

The Abdication of Napoleon.—

The Congress of Vienna.—

MYERS—"The Revolution had destroyed privilege as expressed in the effete feudal aristocracies of Europe, and

impaired beyond restoration the monstrous doctrine of the divine right of Kings."

Comment—That the reader may have a true conception of the doctrine of "the divine right of Kings," we offer a few words of explanation. All authority is divine, and so parental, civil, and ecclesiastical authority, are divine authority exercised by the parent, the State, and the Church, as God's delegates. Were it not so, the disobedience of children, the treason of citizens, and the insubordination of Catholics, would be sinless. But they are sinful, and sinful for the reason that God rules through the parent, the King, and the Pope, as his delegates and representatives. In this sense, none but a fool will deny the right of Kings to exercise the authority which God has given them, nor the duty of subjects to obey. But if by the divine right of Kings our author mean their right to rule even contrary to God's law, and a divinely imposed obligation on the people to obey them in all things,—only a fool will assert it. In this latter sense the doctrine had a Protestant origin in the reign of James I. of England.

A more common error than this, in our own day, is the doctrine that the ruler is responsible only to the people, and his duty is to execute their will. This is an infidel doctrine that owes its origin to the French Revolution.

The Hundred Days.—

II. France Since the Second Restoration.

Character of the Period.—

Myers—"The aim of the Revolution was to abolish privileges and establish rights."

Comment—Nothing more false could be said; and that you may understand the spirit of political revolutions in general, and the French Revolution in particular, I quote at some length a passage from the writings of the eminent statesman, Dr. Brownson, dated 1850: "I can hardly restrain my indignation when I find our liberal press representing these recent revolutions as attempted in favor of the people. A more God-forgetting and God-forsaken set of mortals it would be difficult to find, than the leaders of the European liberals, who excited these revolutions and sought through them to introduce popular government in the European states. There may be here and there an honest man in the ranks of the party, but among the chiefs I have not found a single one worthy of the least respect for his moral principles or his practical virtue. * * * * * * * * * * *

"Nothing in the world is easier than to gain a reputation by opposing authority, declaiming for liberty, and professing unlimited devotion to the cause of the people. One needs but rattle off a few commonplaces for liberty, or against despotism, to gain the admiration of the multitude, and the name of patriot and people's friend. Chime in with popular passions, and those passions will swell your voice, and sustain you—for a time.

"I was trained to sympathize with European liberals, and to receive as so much law and gospel whatever received the sanction of French infidels, Polish and Italian refugees, and English Whigs. In later years I have asked myself what European liberals, or the liberals in any country, from the Gracchi down to our own time, have ever effected for the liberty or the happiness of the people. In modern times they have frequently been in power. They were in power in England in the seventeenth cen-

tury; they beheaded their King, brushed away the lords temporal and the lords spiritual, and had everything their own way. The nation gladly, to get rid of their misrule, submitted, under Cromwell, to a military despotism—to a slavery hitherto unknown in England. They were in power in Holland under the De Witts, and brought their country to the verge of ruin. They were in power in France in 1789, 1830, and in 1848, and in each instance, as long as they held the power, terror reigned, and there was no security for person or property. Never do they rise to power but they prove themselves real despots, savages, and butchers. No nation has yet been found that could for any considerable length endure their sway, or that has not on the very first opportunity thrown them off. Religion and philosophy teach us that it must be so, and history proves that it is so. The reason is, that every liberal is by nature a despot, and it is his spirit of lawlessness and insubordination that places him in opposition to authority. However he may disguise the matter from himself or others, he wishes to be governed only by his own will, that is, to make his own will the government, which is the essential principle of despotism. When I hear a man declaiming lustily for liberty, I suspect it is for liberty to pick my pocket, or cut my throat."

Reign of Louis XVIII.—

The Revolution of 1830.—

Myers—"King Charles X * * * * seemed utterly incapable of profiting by the teachings of the Revolution. His blind, stubborn course gave rise to the saying: 'A Bourbon learns nothing and forgets nothing.' * * * * The people rose in revolt * * * * the despot was driven into exile."

Comment—Mr. Myers is not an able historian, or he would have escaped this popular blunder. The truth is that the most glorious period of French history since the reign of Louis XIV was that of Charles X., a man and a prince of virtue and ability. And had France been wise enough to hear and heed him, she would now be in possession of her ancient constitution and her ancient glory.

The constitution of a nation cannot suddenly and violently be changed without causing social disorder; and it is to the repeated efforts of liberals to change the constitution by revolution—efforts so eloquently and ignorantly applauded by our author—that France, Spain and Portugal, owe their present degradation.

Establishment of the Second Republic.—

Myers—"Almost every throne upon the continent felt the shock of the French Revolution of 1848. * * * * France had made another of her irresistible invasions of the states of Europe—'an invasion of ideas.'"

Comment—"An invasion of ideas" it is true, but the ideas of the mob. The mob in delirium made Louis Philippe King, and in a second delirium unmade him. What good came of it? Mr. Myers throws up his hat and shouts lustily at the imagined triumph of liberty, because a mob in its wrath has deposed a King, burnt a throne, put an end to a dynasty, and resolved the state into its original elements. Would it not better become a serious author to restrain his enthusiasm until he had studied the consequences, and ascertained if any good had come, or possibly could come, from the fanaticism?

The Second Empire.—

The Third Republic.—

CHAPTER VII.

Russia Since the French Revolution.

Paul I. and Napoleon.—

Myers—"Catherine's son, Paul I., with the sure instinct of a born autocrat, hated the Revolution and all the ideas it represented."

Comment—After reading Mr. Myers' account of the character of the Revolution, and how it infected with discontent, lawlessness, and revolutions, the surrounding nations, far from regarding Paul's hate and alarm as symptoms of an autocratic instinct, rather should we consider them expressions of his instinct of self-preservation.

Alexander I. and the Holy Alliance.—

The Russo-Turkish War of 1828-1829.—

Revolution in Poland.—

Russia and the Revolution of 1848.—

Myers—"Hungary * * * * rose against Austria, and under the lead of the illustrious patriot Louis Kossuth, made a noble fight for freedom."

Comment—Kossuth visited this country in the interest of his revolution, toured it, and made many speeches. Great numbers of our people hailed him as the champion of liberty, the apostle of humanity, the Second Messiah, come to break the power of tyrants and to redeem the human race from bondage. But what was he in truth? A prominent American contemporary thus wrote of him

and his cause: "No one questions that Kossuth is a distinguished revolutionary orator, and in that sort of eloquence—the lowest in the scale and the easiest to be attained to—which is adapted to rouse up the evil passions, and stimulate the natural insubordination of an unreasoning and unscrupulous multitude, he stands pre-eminent. But of the lofty character of a true patriot, of a real lover of liberty, of a wise and prudent statesman, he has as yet given us no indication."

And as to the cause:—"The Magyars (Hungarians) were the oppressors, not the oppressed, and while they were seeking to render themselves independent of the empire, they were fighting to keep eight millions of Hungarians of other races in subjection to themselves."

The Crimean War.—

Emancipation of the Serfs.—

The Russo-Turkish War of 1877-1878.—

Nihilism.—

Myers—"Russian Nihilism is a smothered French Revolution."

Comment—And the French Revolution was Nihilism in full blast,—from which you may learn to condemn both. A Nihilist is a member of a secret organization devoted to the destruction of political, religious, and social institutions. The association is condemned by the Church as the enemy of God and man. It cannot be tolerated by any government, because it is the enemy of all government.

President Roosevelt in his first address, treating of the assassination of President McKinley, said, that dan-

ger encompassing the office would not deter men from aspiring to the chief magistracy, but would arouse public indignation, and effect the passage of more stringent laws, and the more speedy and condign punishment of the guilty. Why? Because Nihilism is tyranny, and governments fight tyranny with severity; and therefore the spirit of the Revolution, whether latent or manifest and active, arouses governments to restrict liberty and intensify severity. Harsh laws should be modified and corrected constitutionally; but should petition, remonstrance and lawful agitation, fail to accomplish the desired legislation, and the tyranny continue, revolution may be lawful; the government forfeits the authority it has abused, and may be justly opposed. However, the private citizen is not the judge competent to determine when resistance is lawful.

CHAPTER VIII.

German Freedom and Unity.

Formation of the German Confederation.—

The Uprisings of 1830: *First Step Towards Freedom.—*

Comment—You will see in this and the following paragraphs that Mr. Myers makes popular commotions, insubordination of citizens, and violent attacks upon the rulers, stepping stones to political liberty. Could anything be more absurd! The author would blot out the Fourth Commandment and that part of the Fifth and Seventh that relates to superiors. He shuts his eyes to the fact that rulers have rights as well as subjects, and that citizens can tyrannize as well as Kings.

The Customs Union: *First Step Towards Unity.—*

Uprisings of 1848: *A Second Step Towards Freedom.—*

Myers—"The Revolution of 1848 thus effected much for the cause of liberal government in Germany."

Comment—How? Mr. Myers answers: "The movements of that revolutionary year brought into the hands of the people much more power than they had ever before exercised." But is there no danger of the people getting too much power? Is there no danger of them getting more power than they can wisely exercise? There is great danger; and we see a proof of it in the unstable South American republics. Popular intelligence and virtue are required in the degree that the people participate

in the government. It is more difficult to command wisely than to obey.

But how did the people of Germany use the new powers which they had wrung from Frederick William IV? Mr. Myers tells us that the popular assemblies were ignorant and incompetent.

The National Assembly: Efforts After Union.—

Hungary: Kossuth.—

Comment—It is high time that Kossuth was relegated to his proper place in history. A mercenary demagogue, he travelled over England and America making inflammatory speeches, and collecting money for, he said, the liberation of his people. After gathering together an enormous sum, he slipped away from New York under cover of night and the assumed name of Alexander Smith, without paying his board-bill, and returned to Europe to live in regal luxury, where he recently died at an advanced age. He was as great a fraud as ever came to America, and that is saying a great deal.

Rivalry Between Austria and Prussia.—

The Seven Weeks' War Between Austria and Prussia—

Establishment of the North-German Union.—

The Franco-Prussian War.—

Establishment of the New German Empire.—

CHAPTER IX.

The Liberation and Unification of Italy.—

Three Centuries of Servitude.—

MYERS—"The wars and contentions of the nineteenth century have been, indeed, almost as numerous and constant as were those of the preceding ages, but they have been animated, on one side at least, by a singleness and loftiness of purpose which have not only redeemed them from all triviality but have lent to them the very greatest dignity, significance, and interest."

Comment—We presume that the author alludes to those gigantic military robberies which, under the name of wars, violently seized and appropriated the smaller states of Italy. More ruthless and shameless expeditions have never received the commendation of an historian.

Italy at the Downfall of Napoleon.—

MYERS—" 'Italy was divided on the map, but she had made up her mind to be one.' "

Comment—As Italy comprised at the time millions of citizens, and numerous principalities of very diverse political constitution and ambition, for the author to say that "Italy had made up her mind to be one," is a confession that he has no mind at all. No good Catholic favored the union that has been effected.

MYERS—"The Revolution had sown the seeds of liberty, and time only was needed for their maturing."

Comment—If the ratio of anarchists to the whole population, and the percentage of emigrants, be what it is considered to be, an index of the wretchedness of the nation, Italy with all its fertility, salubrity and beauty, is one of the most wretched and ill-governed of nations. The seeds of the Revolution have matured.

Arbitrary Rule of the Restored Princes.—

MYERS—"In the Papal States the restored Pope went to the most absurd lengths in his policy of restrogression."

Comment—Let us see what his retrogressive acts were.

MYERS—"The Inquisition was again set up."

Comment—To bring to judgment those anarchists in whose heart the Revolution had sown the seeds of liberty (?), and who only waited an opportunity to garner the harvest by the murder of civil and ecclesiastical authorities, and the overthrow of Church and State.

MYERS—"A strict censorship of the press established."

Comment—To prevent the publication of the most erroneous, wicked, and dangerous documents ever composed—false theories of government, vindications of revolution, slurs upon Christianity, slanders against the Church, and impious blasphemies against God.

MYERS—"Convents that had been closed, were reopened."

Comment—Was that a policy of restrogression? Hitherto we have given the author credit for being an honest infidel, but now we think the adjective is undeserved. It is astonishing to what lengths a man can go when he weds false principles and follows them out.

MYERS—"Vaccination * * * * was abolished."

Comment—Yet we have been informed that many more people die from vaccination than from small-pox. This may not be a good argument against vaccination, but it has some weight; and as the art of vaccinating was then in its infancy, doubtless the mortality was greater; besides, there may have been special reasons for its suppression.

Thus the charges preferred against the Pope's policy amount to nothing; and words fail us to adequately designate the stupidity and presumption of the author.

MYERS—"In Sardinia, King Victor Emanuel I. instituted an equally retrograde policy. * * * * The monks were given back their monasteries, which had been converted into factories."

Comment—Where will the madness of this madman stop! Does he approve the policy that would confiscate private property, or having confiscated it, would retain it? Does he condemn the policy of our government in restoring to the Philippine monks their monasteries seized by the rebels? Surely, he merits a place with Robespierre, Danton, Marat, and the other "liberals."

The Carbonari: Uprising of 1820-1821.—

MYERS—"The natural results of the arbitrary rule and retrogessive policy of the restored princes was deep and wide-spread discontent. The French Revolution * * * * had sown broadcast in Italy the seeds of liberty, and their growth could not be checked by the repressions of tyranny. * * * * The Carbonari (charcoal burners), * * * * organized at first to oppose tyranny in the Church, now turned their opposition against despotism in the State."

ST. ALBERT'S COLLEGE LIBRARY

Comment—Give it up, Mr. Myers, give it up! There is no hope. You may talk and write until you are as black in the face as any charcoal-burner, but you can never convince the American reader that there is any sympathy between carbonarism and civil and religious liberty. John De Witt who was a Supreme Patriarch in the society, tells us that they who are initiated into the seventh degree swear to effect the ruin of every religion, and of every positive government, whether despotic or democratic; and that in pursuance of their oath, every means, even poison and perjury, are counted permissible. The revelation of DeWitt surprised few, for the detestable sect had already established a reputation for deviltry. Now, these criminals are Mr. Myers' pets, his patriots, and his liberals. It might be prudent for the Cincinnati police to keep an eye on our author.

The Revolution of 1830-1831.—

MYERS—"The revolution in France which placed Louis Philippe upon the French throne sent a tremor of excitement and hope through all Italy. The centre of the revolution was the Papal States, the people of which were suffering a worse than Oriental despotism."

Comment—The French Revolution introduced Freemasonry into Italy; and when Napoleon reached the height of his power, the Italian lodges became his principal support in the peninsula. In 1812 the Grand Orient of Paris had jurisdiction over 1,089 dependent lodges in Italy, and received from them annually 2,000,000 francs for the French Grand-master, Joseph Bonaparte. The Carbonari numbered about 500,000 in the Two Sicilies alone, and all Italy was honey-combed with Mazzinian lodges of the society called "Young Italy," the object of

whose institution was the destruction of all the governments of the peninsula in order to form one republican state in their place. They hated the Church as wicked and desperate men always do, especially when their enterprises are opposed by her. Mr. Myers eulogizes the lawless leaders of these secret societies and is never tired of praising their daring enterprises. Bearing this in mind, the reader will understand that the Papal government is called despotic because it brought some miscreants to justice. But the only charge that with any show of justice could rightly be preferred against the Papal government is, that it was too lenient, too paternal.

Myers—"One party, known as 'Young Italy,' founded and inspired by the patriot Joseph Mazzini, wanted a republic."

Comment—Joseph Mazzini was a conspirator by nature whose watchword was, "The Italian people are called to destroy Catholicism in the name of continuous revolution."

The Revolution of 1848-1849.—

Myers—"Charles Albert, King of Sardinia, unfortunately a rash and incapable man, though a true-hearted and zealous patriot * * * * declared war against Austria."

Comment—Charles Albert is not in good odor with revolutionists and their sympathizers, for, having been a Carbonaro, he later received the grace to be ashamed of the sect and abandon it.

Myers—"Meanwhile Rome, under the inspiration of Mazzini and Garibaldi, had risen and driven out the Pope, —who had disappointed all the hopes which his earlier

espousal of the popular cause had awakened,—and metamorphosed itself into a Republic."

Comment—There never was a truer friend of Italy, a greater lover of Italian freedom, or a ruler more willing to sacrifice himself for his people, than Pius IX. He favored at first the adoption by the Italian states of liberal constitutions, and the formation of a national league, as the German states had done; but when the impious designs and secret machinations of the popular leaders were revealed to him, justice compelled him to withdraw his co-operation and approval. Because he would not abet, or connive at robbery, he was condemned by the false liberals, and by Mr. Myers.

MYERS—"The new Tiberine Republic was overthrown by the troops of the New French Republic, and the Pope was re-installed. * * * * The dream of Italy's unity and freedom (was) dispelled by the hard present fact of renewed tyranny and foreign domination."

Comment—A historian who will openly applaud robbery, could doubtless write a more interesting history of himself than of Italy.

Victor Emmanuel, II., Count Cavour, and Garibaldi.—

Comment—Three great men;—great in designs, great in daring, great in deviltry;—the first a royal usurper, the second a scheming and unscrupulous politician, and the third a gigantic robber. Now we will hear, with what patience we can, Mr. Myers tell the thrilling tale, of how these three geniuses, full of the spirit of freedom, patriotism, and philanthropy, wrought the herculean task of unifying and liberating Italy.

The Austro-Sardinian War.—

MYERS—"The outcome was that Austria retained Ven-

ice. * * * * But Sardinia found compensation for Venice in the accession of Tuscany, Modena, Parma, and Romagna, the peoples of which states, having discarded their old rulers, besought Victor Emmanuel to permit them to unite themselves to his kingdom. Thus as the result of the war, the King of Sardinia had added to his subjects a population of 9,000,000."

Comment—Let us look these facts squarely in the face and understand them. Sardinia, aided by France, made an unprovoked war on Austria, wrested from her Lombardy, and appropriated it to herself. No cause, or even offense, can be assigned for the war, except that Sardinia wanted to get possession of all Italy, and France wanted the left branch of the Rhine for her boundary. There was no other reason for the war. The several independent ducal states fell with Austria, with whom they were closely allied, and were invaded and taken possession of by the Sardinian King. No more manifest act of injustice ever came before a police-judge than the Austro-Sardinian War, and the appropriation of the ducal states; yet learned men, with what consciences and by what principles we know not, sit in judgment on the crime, and pronounce it lawful and laudable.

As to the states beseeching "Victor Emmanuel to permit them to unite themselves to his kingdom," the American youth is familiar enough with practical politics to make a good guess as to how that was done. It was part of the plan of the "Big Three."

Sicily and Naples Added to Victor Emmanuel's Kingdom.—

MYERS—"Garibaldi, * * * * having gathered a band of a thousand or more volunteers, set sail from Genoa for

Sicily, * * * * and quickly drove the troops of King Francis out of the island. Then, crossing to the mainland, he marched triumphantly to Naples, whose inhabitants hailed him tumultuosly as their deliverer."

Comment—The convicts whom he released from the prisons, hailed him as their deliverer; and so did the red-shirt republicans like himself, the Carbonari, anarchists, liberals, and all of Mr. Myers' patriots and heroes.

This stab at civil order, this lawless attack upon peaceable and legitimate authority, is characterized by our author, an exploit of "the romantic and adventurous daring of the hero Garibaldi." The James and Younger Brothers' raids are not less worthy of praise.

MYERS—"The hero Garibaldi, having first met and hailed his sovereign 'King of Italy,' surrendered his dictatorship, and retired to the island of Capri, in the Bay of Naples. He had earned the lasting gratitude of his country."

Comment—Every adventurer has his admirers.

MYERS—"Thus was another great step taken in the unification of Italy. Nine millions more of Italians had become the subjects of Victor Emmanuel."

Comment—Try to understand this second great outrage perpetrated in the name of freedom. The kingdom of the Two Sicilies was invaded by Garibaldi and his filibusters backed by the Sardinian government, conquered, and appropriated, as the highwayman appropriates the traveller's purse.

Death of Cavour.—

MYERS—"A few months after the liberation of Naples and Sicily, the beloved Count Cavour, over-burdened with cares and anxieties, was taken away by sudden death."

Comment—He had reason to be anxious at the approach of death; yet he was the least despicable of the three criminal confederates. He was a renegade, and made open war upon the Church; but he was benevolent, and at times beneficent; and it is quite certain that he died repentant, and reconciled to the Church.

Venetia Added to the Kingdom.—

MYERS—"Victor Emmanuel formed an alliance with the King of Prussia, one of the conditions of which was that no peace should be made with Austria until she had surrendered Venetia to Italy. The speedy issue of the war added the coveted territory to the dominions of Victor Emmanuel."

Comment—The acquisition of Venetia had all the disgraceful characteristics that marked the robbery of Lombardy and the theft of the Two Sicilies. It was made in pursuance of the same policy.

Rome Becomes the Capital.—

MYERS—"In 1865 the seat of the government was transferred to Florence. But the Italians looked forward to the time when Rome, the ancient mistress of the peninsula and of the world, should be their capital."

Comment—Mr. Myers would have you think that the Italians unanimously, or nearly unanimously, favored the forcible abolition of the papal government, and the unification of Italy. This is untrue. When Victor Emmanuel had ordered General Cadorna to advance upon Rome and storm the Eternal City, the General sent forward an envoy with letters from the King, to assure the Pope that his person would be protected and respected.

When Pope Pius had read the royal missive, he quietly remarked: "They speak of guarantees. Who will guarantee these guarantees? Your King cannot guarantee them. Your King is no longer King; he is dependent on his parliament, and that parliament depends on the secret societies." Then the ambassador begged the Pope to judge the King by his good intentions, and to remember, above all, that Victor Emmanuel was merely the executor of the will of twenty-four millions of Italians. "You lie, Signore," cried Pius IX,; "you calumniate Italy. Twenty-three millions of the Italians are devoted to me, and ask for only one thing—that the Revolution leave them and the Pope in quiet. There may be a million whom you have poisoned with false doctrine and with shameful greed; and these are the friends of your King, and the abettors of his ambition. Go, sir! You shall receive my reply tomorrow. Now my grief and indignation will not allow me to write."

MYERS—"The Italian government * * * * gave notice to the Pope that Rome would henceforth be considered a portion of the Kingdom of Italy, and forthwith an Italian army entered the city, which by a vote of 133,-681 to 1,507 joined itself to the Italian nation."

Comment—If the vote had been taken before the Italian army entered the city, the figures might have been reversed. But the invader had already usurped the government, cannon commanded the streets, the city had been bombarded, the red-shirt assassin with drawn dagger was in possession, and violence, confiscation, and murder, terrorized the inhabitants. Life and property were at the mercy of the mob, and the intruders had no intention of relinquishing the prey, howsoever the vote stood. Pru-

dence, therefore, counselled compliance with the enemy's will.

Mr. Myers in adducing this argument to justify the course of the Revolution, does but weaken his cause.

End of the Temporal Power of the Pope.—

MYERS—"The Pope protested against this invasion of his dominions, this spoliation of the Father of the Church, and called upon the King of Prussia to become the defender of Rome, prophesying the upheaval and overthrow of everything in the world should the sacrilege be allowed."

Comment—There are men who find it almost impossible to tell the truth; who never relate an extraordinary event without framing at least one lie. The author's statement of the Pope's prophecy is untrue.

MYERS—"So, without a hand being raised in his defense, the Pope was stripped of every vestige of that temporal power wherewith Pepin and Charlemagne had invested the Bishop of Rome more than a thousand years before."

Comment—Which silence and indifference of the powers is the saddest commentary on the worldliness of our so-called Christian governments.

The following was written of Pope Pius IX. at the time: "His attitude is that of his Master when he trod the wine-press alone, and of the people none were with him. It is grand, it is sublime, beyond the power of mortal man, unless assisted with strength from above. No man, it seems to us, can contemplate his attitude, firm and inflexible, calm and serene, without being filled, if he have any nobility or generosity of soul, or any sense of

moral heroism or true manliness in him, with admiration and awe, or feeling that his very attitude proves that he is in the right, and that God is with him."

Conclusion.—

Comment—A stranger to the author, after careful perusal of this chapter, would naturally conclude that he was a captain of a band of freebooters, or the leader of a gang of highwaymen. In the "Conclusion" he informs us that, "Reform and progress have marked Italian affairs since the events of 1870." The Pope, he says, has stubbornly opposed the progress; and ignorance and bigotry have stood in the way, but the government has succeeded. Then follows a list of reform measures, and at the head stands the most salutary and the most sublime;—two hundred and forty establishments of piety and charity have been stolen, the offices that were performed in them, suppressed; the poor, aged, feeble, sick, and helpless inmates there cared for, driven out; and the proceeds from the sale of the property pocketed by Mr. Myers' liberals, patriots, and heroes. Further comment is unnecessary.

CHAPTER X.

England in the Nineteenth Century.

The Three Chief Matters.—

I. Progress Towards Democracy.

Introductory.—

Effects of the French Revolution Upon Liberalism in England.—

Revival of Democratic Sentiments.—

The Reform Bill of 1832.—

Chartism: The Revolutionary Year of 1848.—

The Reform Bill of 1867.—

The Reform Bill of 1884.—

Only the Forms of Monarchy Remain.—

II. Expansion of the Principle of Religious Equality.

Religious Freedom and Religious Equality.—

Myers—"Progress in this direction (toward religious equality), will consist in the growth of a really tolerant spirit, which shall lead to the removal from Catholics, Protestant dissenters, and Jews, of all civil disabilities, and the placing of all sects on an absolute equality before the law. This is but a completion of the work of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries."

Comment—Which means, we presume, that religious toleration was inaugurated by the Reformation in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. On the contrary, "in no country was the reformation introduced but by the aid of the civil power, and in no state in which it gained the mastery did it fail to be established as the religion of the state, and to obtain the suppression by force or civil pains and penalties of the old religion, and of all forms even of Protestant dissent. The state religion was bound hand and foot, and could move only by permission of the temporal sovereign, and no other religion was tolerated. We all know the penal laws against Catholics in England, Ireland, and Scotland, re-enacted with additional severity under William and Mary, almost in the eighteenth century. James II., it is equally well known, lost the crown of his three kingdoms by an edict of toleration, which, as it tolerated Catholics, was denounced as an act of outrageous tyranny. The penal laws against Catholics were adopted by the Episcopalian colony of Virginia, and the Puritan colony of Massachusetts made it an offense punishable with banishment from the colony for a citizen to harbor a Catholic priest for a single night, or to give him a single meal of victuals. It was only in 1788 that the Presbyterian Assembly of the United States expunged from their confession of faith the article which declares it the duty of the civil magistrate to extirpate heretics and idolaters—an article still retained by their brethren in Scotland, and by the United Presbyterians in this country, unless very recently cancelled."

Methodism and Its Effects Upon Toleration.—

MYERS—"The Methodists at first had no thought of

establishing a church distinct from the Anglican. * * * * Their enthusiasm, and their often extravagant manners, however, offended the staid, cold conservatism of the regular (Episcopal) clergy, and they were finally constrained by petty persecution to go out from the established organization and form a church of their own."

Comment—The author thinks that "petty persecution" justifies the persecuted in establishing a new church. The author has lost, and Protestants are fast losing, all true conception of Christianity and the Christian Church. Men now-a-days establish new churches and devise new creeds, and then dissolve them, very much as children build and destroy block-houses. George Whitefield and John Wesley worked harmoniously so long as their aim was to found and preserve a mere religious society, but when their purpose changed to the establishment of a church, they disagreed, and "Whitefield became the leader of the Calvinistic Methodists, and Wesley the founder of the sect known as Wesleyans."

Disabilities Removed From Protestant Dissenters.—

Disabilities Removed From the Catholics.—

Disabilities Removed From the Jews.—

Disestablishment of the Irish Church.—

MYERS—"The Irish have always and steadily refused to accept the religion which their English conquerors have somehow felt constrained to try to force upon them."

Comment—The author says that the English government has "somehow felt constrained" to force their heresy upon the Catholic Irish. Seldom have we seen a terrible arraignment couched in so courteous terms. This polite and excusatory mode of speech may perchance be also

a "completion of the work of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries," and if generally adopted will work a radical change in our English tongue. For example, how would this sound?—"Our venerable fellow-citizen, Mr. P. V. N. M., while returning to his home on College Hill late last night, was politely accosted by the Hon. Highway Hans, alias Blizzard Bill, who 'somehow felt constrained' to deal him a crashing blow on the point of the jaw, and relieve him of the burden of his watch and purse."—Cincinnati Enquirer.

Proposed Disestablishment of the State Church in England and Scotland.—

III. Growth of the British Empire in the East.

The Clew to England's Foreign Policy in the Nineteenth Century.—

Rise of the English Power in India.—

The Afghan War of 1838-1842.—

Opium War With China.—

The Crimean War.—

The Sepoy Mutiny.—

Later Events: The English in Egypt.—

Conclusion: The New Age.

The Age of Material Progress, or the Industrial Age.—

The Labor Problem.—

Myers—"The great problem of the first era was the proper distribution of authority in religious matters; that

of the second era was the distribution of power in the State; that of this new epoch is the equitable distribution of the products of industry."

Comment—Mr. Myers imagines that the primitive Church was a pure ecclesiastical democracy, and that Mary Magdalen, the Good Thief, Nicodemus, and St. Peter, stood on a perfect equality as to authority. Verily, our author has made, or borrowed, an invention as astounding, if not so useful, as that of Morse or Fulton. But he could have saved himself the labor of perfecting his theory, had he only known that there was no distribution of religious authority to be made, for Christ Himself had made the distribution in the beginning. The Church came from the hands of Christ a perfect work.

MYERS—"The democratizing of the Church and State has rendered inevitable, it is urged, the democratizing of property."

Comment—What is the blunderbuss trying to say? The Church of Christ has never been democratized, has never been changed as to its constitution, neither can it be, for Christ has promised that His church shall remain unchangeable and indestructible. Some heretics thought that they could democratize the Church: they succeeded only in disfranchising, despoiling, and expatriating themselves.

Socialism.—

MYERS—"Christianity is essentially socialistic. It condemns individualism."

Comment—What does this mean, "Christianity condemns individualism?"

MYERS—"It forbids one to pursue his individual interests at the expense of another."

Comment—No, it does not. It does not forbid competition; but it forbids one to pursue his individual interests at the "unjust" expense of another: for example,—it forbids theft.

MYERS—"It enjoins every one to look, not on his own things, but also on the things of others."

Comment—Which statement is both bad grammar and bad ethics. Good grammar and good ethics require the insertion of a word which makes the sentence read thus: It enjoins everyone to look, not "only" on his own things, but also on the things of others.

Good ethics requires the insertion of the word "only," because the Second Great Commandment says: "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself." We are commanded to love ourselves. "Charity begins at home;" that is, rightly ordered charity requires that after God, a man love himself first, and then those who are near to him, in proportion to their nearness, eminence, excellence, etc., and, when necessary, labor and sacrifice himself for them accordingly. The Christian Socialism that would violate the divine order of charity is a misnomer, and should be called anti-Christian socialism.

When charity enjoins that we seek our own good before the good of others, spiritual, not earthly, good is meant.

MYERS—"The numerous building and loan associations among us, which are essentially socialistic in principle, are a further illustration of the progress the idea is making, an additional evidence of the practicability and advantages of the system."

Comment—Why are the advantages of these associations embraced? Is it not because they appeal to the self-interest of the investor? We fear the author has lost sight of his hobby.

MYERS—" 'Nothing else can solve it (the labor problem) than the application of the principles of Christianity to industrial organization, as they have already been applied to political and ecclesiastical organization.' "

Comment—There were no "principles of Christianity" to apply, prior to Christianity itself; and there was no Christianity prior to the Church; therefore, prior to the Church the "principles of Christianity" could not be applied to the "ecclesiastical organization." Neither could the "principles of Christianity" be applied to the "ecclesiastical organization" posterior to the Church, because already had they been applied by Christ our Lord in the very institution of the Church.

It seems that the author has now lost, not only his hobby, but his head.

Our task is done, and we shall only add what a retrospect discloses, that the author's central and pervading defect is his failure to recognize the authority of God in his institutions, the Church and State; and hence his assumption that the people, from whom, he thinks, all ecclesiastical and political power emanates, and in whom it dwells, have the right to revolutionize at will the constitutions of both. This conclusion is in direct contradiction of the declaration of St. Paul that, "There is no power but from God; and those that are, are ordained of God. Therefore, he that resisteth the power resisteth the ordinance of God, and they that resist purchase to themselves damnation." And because all power is from God, therefore do ecclesiastical, political, and parental com-

mands bind the conscience, and their transgression is not free from moral guilt. But on the author's principle, Church and State are, at least as to their constitution and government, purely human institutions, and therefore can, at the will of the subjects, be resisted and overthrown with moral impunity; for certainly what has not divine sanction, can be opposed without sin. This error, so radical and so extensive, permeates and vitiates the whole work.

FINIS.

8922 270.3 R15
Randall, William E.
AUTHOR
Mistakes and Misstatements
TITLE

DATE LOANED	BORROWER'S NAME	DATE RETURNED

ST. ALBERT'S COLLEGE LIBRARY